DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 846 UD 014 084

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | An Evaluation of State Urban Education Programs for Disadvantaged Students in District 24, New York City. |
| INSTITUTION | New York Univ., N.Y. Center for Field Research and School Services. |
| SPONS AGENCY | New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. |
| PUB DATE | 31 Jul 73 |
| NOTE | 150p.; Function Number 79-36452, 36453 |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Diagnosis; *English (Second Language); English Instruction; Individualized Instruction; Paraprofessional School Personnel; *Program Evaluation; Reading Diagnosis; Reading Readiness; *Remedial Reading Programs; School Districts; Urban Education; Writing Skills |
| IDENTIFIERS | *New York City |

ABSTRACT

During the 1972-73 school year the educational program in Community School District 24, New York City, was supplemented by a quality incentive grant from State Uurban Education funds. These funds were used to establish two programs. The major objectives of the Corrective Reading program were: (1) to provide corrective reading diagnostic and prescriptive services for each participant so that he will increase his competence in reading; and (2) to increase individualization of instruction for program participants through the services of paraprofessionals as a means of increasing pupil growth in reading. The data presented in this report support the conclusion that the program was successful in achieving its objective. The major objective of the English As A Second Language (ESL) program was to increase the ability of non-native speaking pupils to understand and speak English. A corollary objective of the program was to move ESL students toward the acquisition of reading and writing skills in English as readiness is attained. Among the findings revealed by the evaluation of the program operation were the following: (1) major changes in the planned program design were made at each school; these changes did result in more students being serviced by the program than originally planned, but the changes also resulted in a concomitant reduction in the average amount of instruction in English received by students in the program and (2) there was high mobility in the non-English speaking student population. (Author/JM)

ED 087843

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Function Nos. 79-36452
79-36453

# AN EVALUATION OF STATE URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS IN DISTRICT 24 NEW YORK CITY

State Urban Education Grant

An evaluation of a New York City school district education project funded by the New York State Urban Education Program enacted at the 1970 Legislative Session of the New York State Legislature for the purpose of "meeting special educational needs associated with poverty" (Education Law 3602, subdivision II as amended), performed under a contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1972-73 school year.

Project Co-Directors

Paul A. Cullinan
Angela M. Jaggar

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND FIELD SERVICES
School of Education
New York University

July 1973

UD 014 084

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The directors of the project wish to express appreciation to the following members of the professional staff of the evaluation team:

Professor Bernice E. Cullinan, New York University

Professor Harvey Nadler, New York University

and to the Research Assistants:

Gloria Dwyer, Diana Leo, Michal Pelzig, Maggie Ramsay, Carroll Seron and Jean Weiss

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the District office administration and staff in all aspects of this evaluation. The cooperation of the corrective reading teachers, teachers of English to speakers of other languages, program coordinators and the project director made this report possible.

Finally, we would like to thank the liaison officers, teachers, principals, and pupils of the schools for their continued support and cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


LIST OF TABLES..... iv

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... vi

INTRODUCTION..... xviii

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM..... 1

- Program Objectives..... 1
- Evaluation Objectives..... 1
- Methods of Data Collection..... 2
- Description of Program in Operation..... 2
- Effects of Program on Children..... 26
- Summary and Conclusions..... 52
- Recommendations..... 57

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM..... 61

- Program Objectives..... 61
- Evaluation Objectives..... 61
- Methods of Data Collection..... 61
- Description of Program in Operation..... 62
- Effects of Program on Children..... 76
- Summary and Conclusions..... 86
- Recommendations..... 88

APPENDICES..... 90

- Corrective Reading Program, A-E..... 90
- English As A Second Language Program, A-E..... 116

LIST OF TABLES


Page

Corrective Reading Program

Table 1. Location of State Urban Corrective Reading Centers and Number of Pupils Serviced..... 3

2. Corrective Reading Teachers' Evaluation Of Inservice Training Program..... 9

3. Comparison of Teachers', Principals', And Coordinator's Overall Evaluation Of Inservice Training Program..... 11

4. Mean Ratings For Program Organization, Physical Facilities And Materials..... 13

5. Mean Ratings For Pupil Selection, Diagnosis And Evaluation Procedures..... 16

6. Mean Ratings For Student And Parent Attitudes Toward Program..... 20

7. Mean Ratings For Personnel Support..... 23

8. Number And Percentage Of Pupils Making Gains Below, The Same As, And Above Anticipated On The Metropolitan Achievement Test..... 29

9. Tests of Significance For Actual And Above Anticipanted Gains On The Vocabulary Subtest Of The Metropolitan Achievement Test..... 32

10. Tests Of Significance For Actual And Above Anticipated Gains On The Comprehension Subtest Of The Metropolitan Achievement Test..... 33

11. Tests Of Significance For Actual And Above Anticipated Gains On The Total Reading Score Of The Metropolitan Achievement Test..... 34

List of Tables (Continued)


Page

Table 12. Number And Percentage Of Pupils Making Gains Below, The Same As, And Above The Anticipated Grade Level Score On The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test..... 36

13. Tests Of Significance For Actual And Above Anticipated Gains On The Grade Level Score Of The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test..... 38

14. Number And Percentage Of More Severely And Less Severely Retarded Elementary Pupils Making Gains Below, The Same As, And Above Anticipated..... 40

15. Comparison Of Gains Of More Severely And Less Severely Retarded Elementary School Pupils..... 42

16. Pre- To Post- Test Gains On Subtests Of The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test..... 44

17. Pre- To Post- Program Changes In State Urban Students' Reading Attitude..... 46

18. Comparison Of State Urban Program With Tax Levy Program..... 49

English As A Second Language Program

Table 1. Schools And Number Of Teachers In The ESL Program.. 62

2. Rank Order And Mean Rating For Observed Instructional Behaviors In ESL Classes..... 68

3. Rank Order And Mean Ratings For Observed Student Behaviors In ESL Classes..... 73

4. Overall Ratings Of Teacher Effectiveness..... 75

5. Analysis Of Gains On The English Oral Language Ability Scale (OLAS)..... 79

6. Comparison Of Number And Percentage At Each Oral Language Fluency Level At The Beginning And End Of The Program..... 81

7. Analysis Of Gains On The Linguistic Capacity Index (LCI)..... 84

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the 1972-1973 school year the educational program in Community School District 24, New York City, was supplemented by a quality incentive grant from State Urban Education funds. These funds were used to establish a Corrective Reading Program and an English as a Second Language Program. The major objectives, findings and recommendations for the two programs are summarized below.

### CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

Program Objectives. The State Urban Education Corrective Reading Program had the following primary objectives:

1. To provide corrective reading diagnostic and prescriptive services for each participant so that he will increase his competence in reading.

2. To increase individualization of instruction for program participants through the services of paraprofessionals as a means of increasing pupil growth in reading.

Findings for Reading Achievement. The data presented in this report support the conclusion that the program was successful in achieving its objective to increase participants' reading achievement levels. The following findings support that conclusion.

1. When actual post-test performance was compared to anticipated performance, more than 50 percent of the students at each grade level and of the total group made gains above expected

in word knowledge, reading comprehension and total reading on the Metropolitan Achievement Test and the comprehension subtest of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. In fact, in total reading achievement, 69 percent achieved above expected, seven percent the same as expected and 24 percent below expected.

2. Grade level comparisons showed that the gains made above those anticipated in word knowledge, comprehension and total reading on the Metropolitan Achievement Test were statistically significant for all grade levels, except the second grade where students' achievement in comprehension was greater than expected but not significantly greater. The same comparison for scores on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test indicated that students in all grades except the second and sixth made gains significantly above those expected in reading comprehension based on their previous rate of growth. The lower gains among second and sixth graders may be accounted for by the relatively small number of students in the evaluation samples. The second and sixth grade students in the evaluation samples did make average gains that were higher than expected but these gains were not significantly higher than expected.

3. Comparisons of the gains of the more severely and less severely retarded readers revealed that more than 50 percent, and often 60 to 70 percent, of the students in each group made gains above expected in all areas of reading measured. A greater percentage, however, of the more severely retarded readers than

of the less severely retarded readers achieved above expected gains in word knowledge, comprehension and total reading as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test and the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test.

4. Although both the more severely and the less severely retarded readers made reading achievement gains significantly above those anticipated for them, there was evidence that the more severely retarded readers made greater gains than the less severely retarded readers. These findings suggest that the program was more successful with students who were more severely retarded in reading at the beginning of the program. Similar findings were reported in the 1971-1972 evaluation and suggest again that the amount of improvement in reading is directly related to the amount of instruction provided.

Findings for Specific Reading Skills. The data presented in this report support the conclusion that the program was successful in increasing participants' performance in specific reading skills. The following finding supports that conclusion.

When pre-test and post-test scores on the appropriate level of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test were compared, gains in all skill areas were significant. Younger students in the program made gains that were generally more significant than gains made by older students in the program.

Findings for Reading Attitude. The third objective of the Corrective Reading Program was to improve program participants' attitude toward reading. Pre-program and post-program scores on the Reading Attitude Index were used to assess progress toward this objective.

The data presented in this report support the conclusion that the program was not successful in improving program participants' attitude toward reading. The following finding supports that conclusion.

When pre-program and post-program scores on the Reading Attitude Index were compared, attitude toward reading was no more positive at the end of the program than it was at the beginning for students at any grade level. Students in the sixth grade became significantly less positive in their attitude toward reading during the year.

Findings for Impact of Paraprofessionals. The data presented in this report support the conclusion that the addition of paraprofessional services did not significantly increase pupils' growth in reading achievement and, therefore, the program objective was not achieved. Students in the State Urban Education Program did show improvement in their attitudes toward reading, however. The following findings support the conclusions stated above.

1. When pre-test and post-test scores of students in the State Urban Education Corrective Reading Program were compared to pre-test and post-test scores for students in the tax levy corrective reading program, no significant differences were found in total reading achievement as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

2. When pre-test and post-test scores of students in the State Urban Education Corrective Reading Program were compared to pre-test and post-test scores for students in the tax levy corrective reading program, significant differences were found in reading comprehension skills as measured by the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test which favored the tax levy students.

3. Attitude toward reading scores of the State Urban Education Corrective Reading Program participants on the Reading Attitude Index were significantly more positive than those of students in the tax levy corrective reading program. It is difficult to attribute the changes in attitude toward reading to the addition of paraprofessional services since the role of the paraprofessional is not clearly evident in teachers' reports of paraprofessionals' duties.

Recommendations. The evidence presented in this report points to the general success of the Corrective Reading Program in affecting significant student progress in basic reading skills

and total reading achievement. Thus, the following recommendations are offered as guidelines for further improving and refining the program now in operation.

1. There were nearly one-third of the program participants who were achieving less than their expected rate of growth. This may be due to weaknesses in diagnostic procedures and the prescriptive instruction used for these children. Every effort should be made to determine the causes for the low achievement of this group, as a means of improving the reading instruction for all children.

2. Since the program has been successful in improving basic reading skills among a large proportion of the population, efforts should now be made to move these students toward increased reading comprehension and higher level critical reading skills. Programmatic efforts could include increased use of a variety of high interest materials and improved teaching skill for the development of interpretive, inferential, analytical and evaluative reading skills. The intent of such efforts would be not only to increase students' reading proficiency but their enjoyment of reading as well. There was evidence that this important corollary objective was not achieved in the current program.

3. The district staff should seriously weigh the gains to be derived from inclusion of second graders in the Corrective

Reading Program. On the basis of the selection instruments and criteria used in the program, it is highly inappropriate to include second graders. It is recommended that the program be limited to students in grades 3 through 9. If early identification of reading or other learning disabilities becomes a goal for District 24, careful study will need to be made of the concomitant implications for screening, selection, program and evaluation procedures.

4. There was again evidence that the amount of improvement in reading achievement was related to the amount of instruction received. Therefore, the staff should continue to accurately assign the more severely retarded readers to the instructional groups that meet more frequently.

5. There was evidence that the level of professional preparation among the reading teachers was higher than the preceding year. This is a desirable trend and the district should make every effort to continue to recruit qualified specialists for the program. However, the number of students who are still not achieving above their previous rate of growth and the need to expand the achievement of those who are making gains above expected to include higher level reading skills do point to the need for continued inservice training that emphasizes the goals of this program.

6. If the objective to provide paraprofessional services as a means of increasing student achievement in reading is to be continued, changes must be made in the role presently assumed by paraprofessionals. The paraprofessionals' role should be defined as primarily instructional; they should receive adequate training for the role, and the reading teachers should be adequately prepared to effectively use the paraprofessionals in the instructional program. If paraprofessionals are not used in instructional roles, then this aspect of the program should be reassessed.

7. Provision must be made for adequate time for reading teachers to confer with parents and classroom teachers who should play a significant cooperative role in the resolution of reading problems.

8. The district staff should continue in the direction of providing adequate diagnostic and prescriptive instruction in the developmental reading program, so that the separate Corrective Reading Program can be phased out. This will permit the reading specialists in each school to become reading resource teachers and teacher trainers who can offer classroom teachers specialized assistance in developing their reading programs.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM

Program Objectives. The primary objective of the State Urban English as a Second Language (ESL) Program was to increase the ability of non-native speaking pupils to understand and speak English.

A corollary objective of the program was to move ESL students toward the acquisition of reading and writing skills in English as readiness is attained.

Findings for Program Operation. The evaluation of the program operation revealed the following findings.

1. Major changes in the planned program design were made at each school. These changes did result in more students being serviced by the program than originally planned, but the changes also resulted in a concomitant reduction in the average amount of instruction in English received by students in the program.

2. The high mobility of the non-English speaking student population brought some instability to the instructional program and further reduced the amount of instruction students received. A number of students were transferred to the mainstream program before their language facility was adequate for academic success in a regular classroom program.

3. A wide range of ESL teacher competence was observed. In general, ESL teachers were skilled in a narrow range of teaching behaviors related to second language learning.

Findings for Students' Receptive and Productive Competence. The evaluation of program effectiveness resulted in the following findings.

1. For the total ESL sample, regardless of grade level, students in the program showed significant pre- to post-program gains in all receptive and productive English language skill areas.

2. A consistent age related pattern of language learning emerged from the data. Children in grades kindergarten through grade three showed the greatest growth in English proficiency, students in grades four through six demonstrated somewhat less growth, while students in grades seven to nine demonstrated the least amount of growth in English proficiency.

While the data did show that students in the ESL program made significant gains in their ability to understand and speak English, no conclusive statement can be made about the program's effectiveness since no comparison group was available. It is difficult to conclude, therefore, that the gains made by the students in the ESL program were greater than those that might have been expected from students in a regular program with no specialized instruction in English.

Recommendations. Based on the findings of this evaluation of the ESL Program, the following recommendations are made.

1. An effort must be made to structure the ESL Program so that students will receive consistent and adequate amounts of instruction in the use of English commensurate with their level of language proficiency.

2. A study should be made of the extent and nature of the population mobility in each school in order to design a program that would provide stable instruction for larger numbers of students. Provisions must be made to offer new arrivals needed instruction in English without transferring students to the mainstream before they are proficient enough in English to succeed academically.

3. There is a need to recruit teachers for the program who have been adequately trained in ESL techniques or to expand the inservice training in order to improve the present ESL teachers' effectiveness.

4. While oral fluency in English is essential as a valid objective, the ESL Program should be expanded to include the tool subjects of reading and writing in English if students are to successfully achieve in the regular school curriculum.

5. Because of the subjective nature of teacher ratings, it is suggested that whenever possible more objective measures, such as the Linguistic Capacity Index, also be used. Multiple measures provide more accurate information for pupil selection, for diagnosis of children's language strengths and weaknesses, and for assessment of pupil achievement in learning English as a second language.

6. Analysis of pre- and post-program scores showed that the youngest children in the program (grades kindergarten to 3) made the greatest gains. Although the greater language learning facility generally found among younger children may account for this finding, other factors such as differences in instructional approach, program structure and teacher effectiveness may have been operating. These and other factors should be examined in order to determine how the effectiveness of the program might be increased in the upper grades.

# INTRODUCTION

During the 1972-73 school year, the regular educational programs in District 24 New York City were supplemented with educational services supported by a Quality Incentive Grant under the New York State Urban Education Program. This report includes evaluations of programs funded under the following headings:

I. Diagnosis and Treatment of Reading Disabilities Program (Corrective Reading) (79-36452)

II. English as a Second Language Program (79-36453)

# CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

## PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The State Urban Education Corrective Reading Program had the following as primary objectives:

1. To provide corrective reading diagnostic and prescriptive services for each participant so that he will increase his competence in reading.

2. To increase individualization of instruction for program participants through the services of paraprofessionals as a means of increasing pupil growth in reading.

## EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

To assess program effectiveness, the following evaluation objectives were delineated:

1. Given pre- and post-test scores, program participants will manifest significant improvement in (a) total reading achievement, (b) specific reading skills, and (c) attitude toward reading.

2. Given pre- and post-program scores, children in the Corrective Reading Program will manifest significantly better improvement in reading achievement and attitude toward reading when compared to students in a parallel program which does not use paraprofessionals.

METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

In order to assess the effectiveness of the program in achieving the stated objectives, the following methods were used. Questionnaires eliciting the background preparation of the Corrective Reading Teachers, their assessment of the inservice training provided, and their assessment of the effectiveness of the program (see Appendix A) were administered. In addition, the opinions of the principals, the program coordinator, and classroom teachers with students in the Corrective Reading Program were elicited through questionnaires (Appendices B,C, and D).

Three measures were used to assess pupil growth in reading. Scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test were used as the measure of pupils' level of reading achievement. Growth in specific reading skills was assessed by scores on the subtests of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, and pupils' attitude toward reading was measured by the Index of Reading Attitude (Appendix E). The three measures were administered on a pre and post test basis.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM IN OPERATION

Program Implementation. During the 1972-1973 school year, District 24 established diagnostic and prescriptive reading centers to service remedial readers in 11 schools, seven elementary, one intermediate and three junior high schools. Table 1 shows the

schools, the number of teachers and the number of students in the Corrective Reading Program.

TABLE 1

LOCATION OF STATE URBAN CORRECTIVE READING CENTERS AND NUMBER OF PUPILS SERVICED

| School | Number of Teachers | Number of Students |
|---|---|---|
| P.S. 13 | 1 | 55 |
| P.S. 14 | 1 | 55 |
| P.S. 19 | 2 | 110 |
| P.S. 68 | 1 | 55 |
| P.S. 81 | 1 | 55 |
| P.S. 143 | 2 | 110 |
| P.S. 199 | 1 | 55 |
| I.S. 61 | 3 | 165 |
| J.H. 73 | 2 | 110 |
| J.H. 93 | 2 | 110 |
| J.H. 125 | 2 | 110 |
| | 18 | 990 |
| **Subtotals** | | |
| Elementary | 9 | 495 |
| Intermediate | 3 | 165 |
| Junior High | 6 | 330 |
| | 18 | 990 |

As Table 1 shows, a total of 990 pupils received corrective reading instruction. Of these, 495 were elementary school children, 165 were intermediate school children and 330 were junior high school students.

Program Organization. This was the second year of operation for the Corrective Reading Program, the basic structure of which was carefully planned and successfully tested during the 1971-72 school year. Based on the evaluation of the first year's program, some modifications were made in the organization of the 1972-73 program. These modifications brought about a needed reduction in the Corrective Reading Teachers' workload.

This year, the design for the State Urban Education program called for each reading teacher to service five instructional groups of approximately 11 students each, a total of 55 pupils per teacher. From the target population at each elementary school, 33 students who were two or more years retarded in reading and 22 students who were less than two years but not less than one year retarded in reading were selected for the program. The 33 more seriously retarded readers were divided into three groups, each of which met three times a week. Two of these groups met for one and a half hour sessions or a total of four and a half hours of instruction a week. The third group of more severely retarded readers met for one hour and 15-minute sessions or a total of three hours and 45 minutes per week. The 22 students

with less severe reading problems were divided into two groups, each of which met two times a week for one and a half hours, a total of three hours of instruction weekly.

Each intermediate and junior high school reading teacher met each of the five instructional groups on a daily basis. All pupils in the program at this level received 45 minutes of instruction per day, five days per week, a total of three hours and 45 minutes per week. Efforts were made to have three of the groups consist of more severely retarded readers, and the other two groups to consist of less severely retarded readers. Organizing instructional groups into more and less seriously retarded readers, as the design specified, was more difficult to do at the secondary schools than at the elementary schools because of scheduling difficulties.

In the schools not eligible for Title I service, three 45-minute periods a week were set aside for teachers to provide additional individualized instruction to program participants in need of special attention in skill development or reading in the content areas. In addition, teachers had two 45-minute preparation periods a week for program related activities such as record keeping, lesson planning, preparation of materials, and conferences with parents, classroom teachers and paraprofessionals. In schools eligible under Title I (P.S. 68, P.S. 81, P.S. 143 and I.S. 61), teachers had all five 45-minute periods per week for

program preparation in accord with the contract with the United Federation of Teachers; however, they could use these periods to provide additional instruction to students who needed special attention.

Program Staff. The program was coordinated by the district's reading specialist for reimburseable programs. His responsibilities included conducting an initial orientation and the biweekly inservice training sessions. Based on last year's evaluation, the elementary and secondary staffs met on alternate weeks so that the inservice training sessions could focus on the special needs and problems of the staff at each level. In addition, the program coordinator was responsible for the ongoing supervision of the program.

1. Corrective Reading Teachers

The 18 Corrective Reading Teachers represented a wide range of teaching experience and background preparation for the task. Of the 17 who responded to the Corrective Reading Teacher Questionnaire (Appendix A), all reported they had obtained the Bachelor's degree, two since 1970, six between 1960 and 1969, and nine before 1960. Twelve of the Corrective Reading Teachers have received a Master's degree, five of whom had reading as their major field. Two others reported they had 30 credits beyond the Bachelor's degree including courses in the teaching of reading. Another indicated she was presently enrolled in a Master's degree program in reading.

When asked to indicate courses they had taken that were relevant to teaching corrective reading, 12 teachers responded they had taken a course in Foundations of Reading Instruction, eight had taken courses in Diagnostic Reading Techniques, Corrective Reading Instruction, and Reading in the Content Areas, and two had a course in Individualized Reading Instruction. Some teachers had also had a course in learning disabilities, reading for the disadvantaged or children's literature.

These findings do indicate that the level of professional preparation among teachers in the State Urban Corrective Reading Program was higher this year than it was last year. However, there are still some teachers in the program who lack adequate background preparation for the program.

The 17 teachers who responded also reported a range of experience in teaching corrective reading. The group as a whole reported from one to eight years of experience in teaching corrective reading in the public schools. Seven had done private tutorial work in reading; five had taught in after-school tutorial reading programs, and four had experience as parent-volunteer reading tutors.

In general, then, the corrective reading staff in this year's State Urban Education Program appeared to have a higher level of professional preparation than last year's staff. Only six of the 18 teachers were new to the District 24 program this

year, indicating that a majority of the teachers were familiar with the basic aims and operation of the Corrective Reading Program.

2. Paraprofessionals

To provide further individualization of instruction to program participants, one full time paraprofessional was assigned to each elementary school Corrective Reading Teacher. Each paraprofessional was to participate in daily and long range planning, provide assistance with individual and small group instruction, assist with record keeping and preparation of materials, and escort students to and from their classes. In addition, the paraprofessionals attended biweekly inservice training sessions and received on-the-job training during the year.

Evaluation of Inservice Training. The inservice training program for the District 24 Corrective Reading Teachers was an attempt to raise the level of teacher effectiveness and thereby increase the possibilities for the success of the program. Bi-weekly sessions conducted by the program coordinator focused on the program components of selection of students, diagnosis and remediation of reading problems. New materials were demonstrated and problems related to the program were discussed. The Corrective Reading Teachers at the elementary level and those at the junior high school level met with the program coordinator on alternate weeks so that the discussions could be more specifically directed toward concerns that were crucial to each group.

The Corrective Reading Teachers were asked to evaluate the adequacy of the information presented in the inservice training program on the Corrective Reading Teacher Questionnaire (see Appendix A). Sixteen of the 18 teachers responded. The rating scale used was: 1=unsatisfactory, 2=barely satisfactory, 3=average, 4=above average, and 5=very satisfactory. Items that were not covered were assigned NC. The tabulation of the ratings appears in Table 2.

TABLE 2

CORRECTIVE READING TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM (N=16)

| Topic | Frequency for Each Rating | | | | | | Mean Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | NC* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Organization, administration & supervision of the program | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 3.9 |
| Program objectives & rationale | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 4.4 |
| Criteria for selection of participants | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 3.9 |
| Procedures for selection of participants | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3.8 |
| Specific procedures for diagnosis | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 4.2 |
| Knowledge of reading skills | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 3.5 |
| Methods of corrective instruction | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 2.9 |
| Use of instructional materials | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3.5 |
| Selection & evaluation of materials | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3.6 |
| Organizing class for instruction | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3.5 |
| Techniques for evaluating progress | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 3.7 |
| Record keeping policies & procedures | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 3.9 |
| Techniques for using paraprofessionals (N=9) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3.6 |
| Techniques for parent involvement | 3 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2.8 |

*Not covered

The frequencies and mean ratings shown in Table 2 indicate that the Corrective Reading Teachers found the information in the inservice training program related to program objectives, rationale, organization and pupil selection to be well above average. Furthermore, it should be noted that no topic presented was rated below 2.8 (close to average). In comparison with the ratings of similar components of the inservice training program during 1971-72, this year's assessment by the Corrective Reading Teachers is generally more positive. The area which elicited markedly increased ratings was techniques for using paraprofessionals (2.6 to 3.6). Corrective Reading Teachers in the program demonstrated a positive level of satisfaction about the content of the inservice training program, although several unsolicited comments on the questionnaires showed some disagreement about the schedule of meetings. The complaint that meetings were too frequent when the time was needed in the classroom was made several times. The need for more demonstration teaching, more stress on learning disabilities and methods as well as examination of materials for the classroom were requested. One teacher wanted to suggest topics for the agenda so that discussions of concrete techniques and problems were included. The State Urban Education Corrective Reading Teachers appeared to have high standards for the inservice instruction they wanted. The requests for specific suggestions to improve their teaching were widespread.

The item ratings of the inservice training program were generally very positive and indicated the Corrective Reading Teachers believed they profited from it.

The principals, Corrective Reading Teachers and the program coordinator were asked to evaluate the amount and the quality of this year's inservice training program and to compare it with the previous year. A comparison of their responses can be seen in Table 3.

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF TEACHERS', PRINCIPALS' AND COORDINATOR'S OVERALL EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

| Item | Corrective Rdg. Tchrs. (N=16) | Principals (N=10) | Program Coordinator (N=1) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Was the amount of inservice training sufficient? | | | |
| NO | 6 | 2 | 0 |
| YES | 9 | 8 | 1 |
| NO RESPONSE | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| On a 1 to 5 scale, give your overall rating for this year's inservice program | | | |
| MEAN RATING | 3.5 | 3.8 | 4.0 |
| Did you (your teachers) participate in last year's inservice program? | | | |
| NO | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| YES | 10 | 9 | 1 |
| Compared to last year this year's training was: | | | |
| INFERIOR | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| ABOUT SAME | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| SUPERIOR | 4 | 6 | 1 |

The responses seen in Table 3 show that the program coordinator and a majority of Corrective Reading Teachers and the principals found the amount of inservice training to be sufficient. These groups found the quality of the inservice training to be well above average. Only two teachers, among those participating the previous year, found the inservice training to be inferior, whereas four teachers and three principals thought it was about the same and four teachers and six principals thought it was superior to the prior year.

The overall ratings of the inservice training program were generally positive and showed a sizeable increase over the ratings of the previous year. Comments which were written on the questionnaires suggested a need for more demonstration teaching by fellow teachers and the coordinator, more demonstrations of diagnostic techniques and specific skill remediation techniques, and more opportunities for new teachers to observe experienced teachers. It should be noted that six of the 16 Corrective Reading Teachers who responded were new to the program this year. The new teachers indicated they would benefit from additional guidance in the implementation of the program.

Evaluation of Program Organization, Facilities and Materials. The organization of the Corrective Reading Program and the facilities and materials used in its operation were evaluated by 17 Corrective Reading Teachers, ten principals, the program coordinator and 63

classroom teachers who had students in the program. The same 1 to 5 rating scale, used throughout all questionnaires, was used to indicate the level of satisfaction for each topic the rating group evaluated. When a group was not asked to rate a specific item, a slash mark is inserted in the tables. The mean ratings for program organization, facilities and materials appear in Table 4.

TABLE 4

MEAN RATINGS FOR PROGRAM ORGANIZATION, PHYSICAL FACILITIES AND MATERIALS

| Item | Reading Teachers (N=17) | Principals (N=10) | Program Coordinator (N=1) | Classroom Teachers (N=63) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program Organization | | | | |
| Organization (scheduling, number of classes, etc.) | 4.2 | 3.9 | 5.0 | 3.5 |
| Amount of time allocated for reading instruction | 4.1 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 3.6 |
| Number of pupils in each group | 3.9 | 3.7 | 4.0 | --- |
| OVERALL RATING | 4.2 | 4.2 | 5.0 | 3.6 |
| Physical Facilities and Materials | | | | |
| Size of room(s) for corrective rdg. instr. | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.0 | --- |
| Physical facilities in room | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.0 | --- |
| Types of instruct. materials provided for program | 4.0 | 4.4 | 5.0 | --- |
| Quantity of materials provided | 4.0 | 4.2 | 5.0 | --- |
| Availability of materials at start of program | 2.9 | 4.0 | 4.0 | --- |
| OVERALL RATING | 3.4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | --- |

The mean ratings shown in Table 4 show that the general level of satisfaction with the Corrective Reading Program organization is well above average. The item receiving the lowest rating from the Corrective Reading Teachers, number of pupils in each group, averaged 3.9 (above average). The 3.9 rating is well above the 2.0 rating given this item in the 1971-72 evaluation. The programmatic change from servicing 78 pupils per teacher to servicing 55 pupils per teacher undoubtedly accounts for the increased ratings. Several Corrective Reading Teachers commented that this year's ratio produced a desirable size for the groups.

The classroom teachers gave the lowest ratings in the assessment of program organization, although they were well above average. Some classroom teachers remarked that the scheduling of students disrupted their classrooms and that missing one and a half hours of regular classroom work was difficult for students who were remedial readers. The general tone of comments volunteered by each rating group was positive, however, and the ratings confirm the favorable attitude toward the Corrective Reading Program organization.

The ratings of physical facilities and materials range from 2.8 to 5.0. The Corrective Reading Teachers themselves do not regard their facilities and materials as favorably as others related to the program regard them. The comparison of current

rather than the one previously used in the program, was an attempt to arrive at a more realistic assessment of students needing remediation. The single achievement score used in previous years tended to inflate actual performance or show the frustration level at which a student could work rather than his instructional level.

The Corrective Reading Teachers, principals, program coordinator and classroom teachers were asked to rate the procedures used for pupil selection, diagnosis and evaluation. The summary of their ratings appear in Table 5. The slash marks show that a particular group was not asked to rate that item.

TABLE 5

MEAN RATINGS FOR PUPIL SELECTION, DIAGNOSIS AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES

| Item | Reading Teachers (N=17) | Principals (N=10) | Program Coordin. (N=1) | Classroom Teachers (N=63) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pupil Selection | | | | |
| Criteria used to select pupils | 2.8 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 2.7 |
| Procedures used to select pupils | 3.4 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| Assignment to groups on basis of severity of reading retardation | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | --- |
| Number of students serviced compared to number who need corrective reading | 2.2 | 2.2 | 4.0 | 2.7 |
| OVERALL RATING | 3.2 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 2.9 |

| Item | Reading Teachers (N=17) | Principals (N=10) | Program Coordin. (N=1) | Classroom Teachers (N=63) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Diagnosis and Evaluation | | | | |
| Use of Informal Reading Inventory | 3.9 | --- | 4.0 | --- |
| Use of Metropolitan Reading Test | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.0 | --- |
| Use of Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test | 3.9 | 4.0 | 4.0 | --- |
| Materials provided for diagnosis and evaluation | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | --- |
| Record keeping system | 3.5 | 4.1 | 5.0 | --- |
| OVERALL RATING | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.0 | --- |

The ratings for pupil selection procedures shown in Table 5 vary from 2.2 to 4.0. The Corrective Reading Teachers and the classroom teachers are least satisfied with aspects of selection. Comments by Corrective Reading Teachers indicate that they would like the screening procedures to be even more thorough. Vision and hearing tests were suggested as needed additions.

The selection criterion related to poverty was criticized by some Corrective Reading Teachers. They point out that even children of average financial circumstances need reading assistance. The requirement to test all children at the beginning of the year to see if they qualify in educational need as well as in financial need is a burdensome task. The plan of assigning students to groups according to level of retardation appears to be satisfactory to the associated staff.

One issue that obviously plagues Corrective Reading Teachers, principals and classroom teachers is the numbers of children who receive specialized instruction in reading in relation to the number who need it. The 2.2 and 2.7 ratings show that few are satisfied with the availability of specialized instruction. It is clear that more students need the additional help than receive it but attempts to resolve this problem will probably create other problems. Some of the funded programs have attempted to service all children who need the help without increasing the size of the professional staff. Thus, more children are serviced but all then receive less individualized help. The result associated with the distribution of limited services is that all children achieve less. The only reasonable way to extend corrective reading services is to increase the number of corrective reading teachers. Maintaining a high quality and thorough corrective reading program must be weighed against broader distribution of services.

The overall ratings of the pupil selection procedures ranged from slightly below average (2.9) by the classroom teachers to above average (4.0) by the program coordinator. The issues involved in the disparate ratings perhaps cannot be resolved but at least should be understood by staff associated with the program. The same disparity existed in the 1971-72 program evaluation and perhaps suggests open discussion of the issues involved.

The evaluation of the diagnosis and evaluation procedures resulted in above average ratings for every aspect assessed. The combined use of the Metropolitan Achievement Test and the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test has increased the overall level of satisfaction with diagnosis and evaluation procedures from the 1971-72 evaluation report. The continued recognition of the need to use the Informal Reading Inventory is supported by the 3.9 and 4.0 mean ratings of Corrective Reading Teachers and the program coordinator.

The Corrective Reading Teachers indicate that they want more materials for diagnosis and evaluation which is in accord with their assessment of materials in the preceding section. The record keeping system was rated lowest by Corrective Reading Teachers (3.5) and highest by the program coordinator (5.0). The revisions made in the procedures for keeping the daily logs apparently have increased the level of satisfaction since the 1971-72 evaluation. The 2.8, 3.0 and 4.0 ratings of the record keeping system in effect during 1971-72 has changed to 3.5, 4.1 and 5.0 for the current record keeping system. One teacher commented that further improvement in record keeping is needed and suggested uniformity and reduction of repetition. All suggestions were constructive, and reflected a desire to perfect the program.

The overall ratings of pupil diagnosis and evaluation are well above average. The revisions made in the present Corrective Reading Program have noticeably increased the level of satisfaction of the staff associated with the program.

Evaluation of Student and Parent Attitudes Toward the Program. The objective to improve students' attitude toward the Corrective Reading Program was assessed directly from student data, however, the Corrective Reading Teachers, principals, program coordinator and the classroom teachers also were asked to judge students' attitude and progress as well as parents' attitude toward the program. The summary of their ratings appears in Table 6. A slash mark indicates that the group was not asked to respond to that item.

TABLE 6

MEAN RATINGS FOR STUDENT AND PARENT ATTITUDES TOWARD PROGRAM

| Item | Reading Teachers (N=17) | Principals (N=10) | Program Coord. (N=1) | Classroom Teachers (N=63) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students | | | | |
| Students' attitudes toward corrective reading classes | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.7 |
| Observable improvement in pupil performance | 4.0 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.2 |
| Parents | | | | |
| Extent of parent involvement in the program | 2.4 | 2.3 | 4.0 | --- |
| Parents' attitude toward program | 3.4 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.7 |
| Time for teachers to confer with parents | 2.9 | 3.3 | 4.0 | --- |

The mean ratings in Table 6 show a positive level of satisfaction from the Corrective Reading Teachers, principals, program coordinator and classroom teachers about students' and parents' attitude toward the program. The ratings range near the 4.0 level indicating that the associated staff believes that the program is viewed above average by students and their parents. Voluntary comments made by several classroom teachers verify the positive nature of students' attitude. Comments such as, "My students like their Corrective Reading Teacher very much and are anxious to go to her room," and "The students in the program have shown a great increase in their desire to read," are indicative of the teachers' assessment of student attitude.

The staff assessment of the observable improvement in pupil performance is nearly as favorable as their assessment of attitudes toward the program. The Corrective Reading Teachers' and the classroom teachers' ratings were lower than the other raters. Many comments by the classroom teachers indicated that their students had made very good progress in reading this year although one questioned attributing the improvement entirely to the Corrective Reading Program.

The items rated lowest in the staff evaluation of parents' attitude and involvement dealt with the extent of parental involvement in the program. Both Corrective Reading Teachers and principals believe that parents' involvement is no more than

barely satisfactory. Both groups believe that parents' attitude toward the program is somewhat above average and that time for parent conferences is about average but it appears they are not satisfied with the extent to which parents actually do become involved in the program.

The staff's ratings of students' attitude is higher than their ratings of parents' attitude toward the Corrective Reading Program. The principals were least positive about the extent of parent involvement. Suggestions about orientation meetings for parents were made by several people.

Evaluation of Personnel Support. The Corrective Reading Teachers, principals, program coordinator and classroom teachers evaluated the level of cooperation, communication and interaction among school personnel in relation to the Corrective Reading Program. The State Urban Education Corrective Reading Program included the use of paraprofessional services at the elementary school level, therefore, an evaluation of the quality of those services is incorporated here.

The summary of the ratings made of the personnel support by the associated staff appears in Table 7. Slash marks show that the item was not rated by that group.

TABLE 7

MEAN RATINGS FOR PERSONNEL SUPPORT

| Item | Reading Teachers (N=17) | Principals (N-10) | Program Coord. (N=1) | Classroom Teachers (N=63) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cooperation of school personnel generally | 3.9 | 4.1 | 4.0 | --- |
| Communication between reading teacher and classroom teacher | 3.6 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.4 |
| Adoption of corrective reading techniques by classroom teachers | 3.2 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.1 |
| Time for corrective reading teachers to confer with classroom teachers | 2.7 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 2.5 |
| Classroom teachers' attitude toward program | 3.5 | 3.6 | 4.0 | --- |
| Paraprofessionals' preparation and skill | 3.5 (N=9) | --- | --- | --- |
| Quality of services provided by paraprofessionals | 4.1 (N=9) | 4.2 | 4.0 | --- |
| Teachers' ability to use paraprofessionals effectively | --- | 4.0 | 4.0 | --- |
| Reading teachers' preparation and skills for program | --- | 4.0 | 4.0 | --- |
| Quality of instruction provided by the Corrective Reading Teacher | --- | 4.0 | 4.0 | --- |
| Ongoing supervision by coordinator | 3.9 | 3.9 | --- | --- |

The ratings shown in Table 7 indicate a generally high level of satisfaction among the staff related to the Corrective Reading Program. The Corrective Reading Teachers, the principals, and the program coordinator believe that the cooperation from school personnel is well above average. A slight variation occurs in the ratings of communication between the Corrective Reading Teachers and the classroom teachers where the ratings drop from around 4.0 to 3.4 and 3.6. An explanation for this decrease is clearly evident in the ratings of another item--time for Corrective Reading Teachers to confer with classroom teachers. The ratings of 2.7, 2.9 and 2.5 assigned to this item by Corrective Reading Teachers, principals and classroom teachers, respectively, show that very few people are satisfied with this aspect of the program. Clearly, more staff conference time is desired.

The ratings of the quality of paraprofessionals' services, the interaction between the Corrective Reading Teachers and paraprofessionals, and the level of preparation of paraprofessionals are very positive. Obviously, all groups view the contribution of the paraprofessionals to be a valid and worthy aspect of the program.

A description of the responsibilities assumed by the paraprofessionals was requested of the Corrective Reading Teachers. The tally of the responsibilities showed that many things paraprofessionals do are not involved with instruction of children.

Organizing materials, distributing and duplicating materials, correcting papers, escorting children and record keeping appear to consume a sizeable portion of the paraprofessional's day. Less than half of the duties listed were directly instructional. The roles fulfilled by the paraprofessionals do not seem to adequately reflect the goal stated for using their services, nor do they reflect the role description in the program proposal which indicates that paraprofessionals would play a significant role in instruction. The proposal stated that paraprofessionals would assist in the prescriptive aspects of the program by having them work directly with individuals or small groups under the supervision of the Corrective Reading Teachers. The additional roles described in the program plan appear to have become the primary roles fulfilled by most paraprofessionals.

The ratings of the quality of instruction provided by the Corrective Reading Teachers and the ongoing supervision provided by the program coordinator were rated well above average. The level of satisfaction toward the central staff of the Corrective Reading Program appears to be high.

Summary Evaluation of the Corrective Reading Program. The Corrective Reading Teachers (CRT),principals, the program coordinator and the classroom teachers were asked to compare the 1972-73 program with the 1971-72 program. The majority of the staff involved the preceding year (11 CRT's, ten principals, one

coordinator, 33 classroom teachers) believed the current program is superior. When asked if they would be interested in participating next year in a similar program, all 17 Corrective Reading Teachers, all principals, and 60 of 63 classroom teachers said yes. It is evident that the District 24 staff is committed to the Corrective Reading Program they have designed and implemented. Support for continued refinement and development is clearly evident in their ratings of their satisfaction with the program.

EFFECTS OF PROGRAM ON CHILDREN

This section includes a discussion of the effects of the program on pupil growth in reading and is organized into four sections: growth in reading achievement, growth in specific reading skills, improvement in reading attitude, and the impact of paraprofessional services.

Growth in Reading Achievement. The first objective of the Corrective Reading Program was to improve participants' level of reading achievement beyond that which would be expected from the regular classroom program.

To assess the extent to which this objective was achieved, children's scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test were analyzed using their historical rate of growth as a control against which to compare the effects of the Corrective Reading Program. In this procedure, a pupil becomes his own control in that his historical rate of growth, which is calculated from his previous

performance record, is used to predict his expected level of performance if he had received no special instruction. The procedure for determining his rate of growth up to the onset of the special program is to subtract 1.0 from his pre-program achievement score and divide the remainder by the number of months the child has been in school, including the number of years he was retained. For example, if a fifth grade student scores 4.0 in September, then based on his 40 months of previous schooling, his historical growth rate would be 3.0 divided by 40 or .075 per month, or .75 per school year. By using the historical rate of growth, the child's achievement level at the end of fifth grade can be predicted, i.e., he should be reading at 4.75 according to her previous performance. If, in fact, his anticipated level of performance is exceeded by his actual performance, then it can be claimed with some assurance that the gain beyond that anticipated was due to the effects of the special instructional program. This procedure was used to determine whether the Corrective Reading Program in District 24 had a significant effect on participants' reading achievement levels.

Scores from the April, 1972 administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Test were obtained from school records as the pre-program measure and were used as the basis for anticipating students' post-test performance the following April, 1973, when the test was again administered on a district-wide basis. Complete

pre- and post-test data for the Metropolitan Achievement Test were available for 713 students or approximately 72 percent of all participants in the State Urban Education Corrective Reading Program. The size of the evaluation sample is sufficiently large to permit generalizations about the effectiveness of the program.

A second measure of reading achievement was provided by the comprehension subtest of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. The pre- and post-test grade level scores for achievement in comprehension also were analyzed using the historical rate of growth method. Most students' pre-program scores were available in school records from the May, 1972 administration of the test. New students in the program were administered the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test in October as a pre-test measure. Adjustments were made accordingly in calculating the students' post-test performances anticipated for May, 1973 when the test was again administered on a district-wide basis. Complete pre- and post-test data on this measure were available for 771 students or approximately 78 percent of the program population.

1. Total Group and Grade Level Results

Using the historical rate of growth method, anticipated post-test scores for the Metropolitan Reading Test were calculated for students in the Corrective Reading Program. The number and percentage of students at each grade level and in the total group who obtained actual post-test scores below, the same as, or above

anticipated in word knowledge, reading comprehension and total reading were compared. The results are presented in Table 8.

TABLE 8

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS MAKING GAINS BELOW, THE SAME AS, AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED ON THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST

| | | WORD KNOWLEDGE | | | COMPREHENSION | | | TOTAL READING | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | N | Below | Same | Above | Below | Same | Above | Below | Same | Above |
| 2 | 5 | 1 (20) | 0 (0) | 4 (80) | 0 ( 0) | 0 (0) | 5 (100) | 0 ( 0) | 0 ( 0) | 5 (100) |
| 3 | 134 | 30 (22) | 9 (7) | 95 (71) | 44 (34) | 6 (4) | 84 ( 62) | 39 (29( | 8 ( 6) | 87 (65) |
| 4 | 137 | 40 (29) | 9 (7) | 88 (64) | 49 (36) | 7 (5) | 81 ( 59) | 42 (31) | 11 ( 8) | 84 (61) |
| 5 | 104 | 30 (29) | 1 (1) | 73 (70) | 24 (23) | 4 (4) | 76 ( 73) | 14 (13) | 6 ( 6) | 84 (81) |
| 6 | 15 | 2 (13) | 0 (0) | 13 (87) | 3 (20) | 1 (7) | 11 ( 73) | 2 (13) | 0 ( 0) | 13 (87) |
| 7 | 90 | 19 (21) | 2 (2) | 69 (77) | 28 (31) | 1 (1) | 61 ( 68) | 19 (21) | 10 (11) | 61 (68) |
| 8 | 164 | 44 (27) | 6 (4) | 114 (69) | 55 (33) | 3 (2) | 106 ( 65) | 42 (25) | 6 ( 4) | 116 (71) |
| 9 | 64 | 17 (26) | 1 (2) | 46 (72) | 20 (31) | 2 (3) | 42 ( 66) | 14 (22) | 9 (14) | 41 (64) |
| Total | 713 | 183 | 28 | 502 | 223 | 24 | 466 | 172 | 50 | 491 |
| Percent | | (26) | (4) | (70) | (31) | (3) | (66) | (24) | ( 7) | (69) |

Table 8 includes results for a small group of second graders for whom data were available. Although the program proposal called for children only in grades 3 through 9 to be selected for the program, one group of second graders was included on a trial basis in one school in the hope that children identified as exhibiting reading

difficulties this early could be helped before their difficulties became serious. The second grade sample is too small to allow generalizations about the effectiveness of the program at this level, but the data are included since their performance figures in the total group results and since the results may reveal trends for children at this grade level.

As the data in Table 8 show, more than 50 percent of the children at each grade level and in the total group made gains above anticipated for them in word knowledge and reading comprehension, two of the subtests on the Metropolitan Achievement Test. With the exception of the second and fifth graders, more children at each grade level achieved actual post-test scores higher than their anticipated scores in word knowledge than in reading comprehension. These results suggest that the instructional program was somewhat more effective at increasing students' reading word knowledge than at developing their skills in reading comprehension. In total reading achievement, which is based on a composite score from the word knowledge and reading comprehension subtests, Table 8 shows that more than 60 percent of the children at each grade level and in the total group made gains above those expected based on their previous rate of growth in reading.

In summary, the data in Table 8 indicate that a substantial majority of the children in the State Urban Education Corrective Reading Program made gains above those expected from their previous

rate of growth, including 70 percent in word knowledge, 66 percent in reading comprehension, and 69 percent in total reading achievement.

Tables 9, 10, and 11 present the pre-test, anticipated post-test and actual post-test means, and the results of the tests of significance for actual and above anticipated gains on the word knowledge and comprehension subtests, and the total reading score of the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

As Table 9 shows, students at all grade levels, except the second and fourth grades, achieved more than one year in word knowledge. Students in grades 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 had achievement levels comparable to or better than that normally expected of average readers in those grades. The second and fourth graders made actual gains of approximately eight months in word knowledge. The data in Table 9 show further that all of the gains in word knowledge were significantly above those anticipated for the children at each grade level based on their previous rate of growth.

Table 10 shows that the actual gains in reading comprehension ranged from nearly seven months for the fourth graders to one year and three months for the seventh graders. The second graders, and the fifth through the ninth graders achieved in reading comprehension at rates normally expected of non-remedial readers. As the t-ratios for the gains above anticipated indicate,

TABLE 9

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR ACTUAL AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED GAINS ON THE VOCABULARY SUBTEST OF THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST

| Grade | N | Pre-Test Mean | SD | Antic. Post-Test Mean | SD | Actual Post-Test Mean | SD | Actual Gain | t-Ratio | p | Gain Above Antic. | t-Ratio | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 5 | 1.52 | .29 | 1.82 | .44 | 2.32 | .43 | .80 | 4.28 | .01 | .50 | 2.27 | .05 |
| 3 | 134 | 2.13 | .30 | 2.69 | .45 | 3.16 | .91 | 1.03 | 14.57 | .0005 | .47 | 6.08 | .0005 |
| 4 | 137 | 2.64 | .51 | 3.18 | .70 | 3.45 | .71 | .81 | 15.52 | .0005 | .27 | 4.81 | .0005 |
| 5 | 104 | 3.28 | .70 | 3.83 | .89 | 4.38 | 1.15 | 1.10 | 9.48 | .0005 | .55 | 4.49 | .0005 |
| 6 | 15 | 3.83 | .74 | 4.40 | .91 | 5.49 | .90 | 1.66 | 6.93 | .0005 | 1.09 | 4.17 | .0005 |
| 7 | 90 | 4.33 | 1.15 | 4.88 | 1.35 | 5.57 | 1.25 | 1.24 | 11.09 | .0005 | .69 | 5.71 | .0005 |
| 8 | 164 | 5.12 | 1.13 | 5.70 | 1.29 | 6.43 | 1.42 | 1.31 | 13.70 | .0005 | .73 | 7.34 | .0005 |
| 9 | 64 | 5.54 | 1.34 | 6.09 | 1.51 | 6.77 | 1.45 | 1.23 | 7.18 | .0005 | .68 | 3.78 | .0005 |
| Total | 713 | 3.70 | 1.52 | 4.25 | 1.63 | 4.82 | 1.81 | 1.12 | 28.29 | .0005 | +.57 | 13.55 | .0005 |

TABLE 10

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR ACTUAL AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED GAINS ON THE COMPREHENSION SUBTEST OF THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST

| Grade | N | Pre-Test Mean | SD | Antic. Post-Test Mean | SD | Actual Post-Test Mean | SD | Actual Gain | t-Ratio | p | Gain Above Antic. | t-Ratio | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 5 | 1.42 | .23 | 1.64 | .34 | 2.82 | 1.18 | 1.40 | 2.40 | .05 | 1.18 | 1.90 | NS |
| 3 | 134 | 2.10 | .38 | 2.64 | .57 | 2.97 | .78 | .87 | 13.45 | .0005 | .33 | 4.65 | .0005 |
| 4 | 137 | 2.64 | .57 | 3.19 | .78 | 3.33 | .69 | .69 | 13.66 | .0005 | .14 | 2.34 | .01 |
| 5 | 104 | 3.22 | .65 | 3.75 | .82 | 4.35 | 1.06 | 1.13 | 12.44 | .0005 | .60 | 6.31 | .0005 |
| 6 | 15 | 4.06 | .73 | 4.68 | .89 | 5.27 | 1.19 | 1.21 | 5.11 | .0005 | .59 | 2.50 | .05 |
| 7 | 90 | 4.71 | 1.09 | 5.31 | 1.29 | 5.98 | 1.52 | 1.27 | 9.03 | .0005 | .67 | 4.58 | .0005 |
| 8 | 164 | 5.57 | 1.41 | 6.21 | 1.62 | 6.68 | 1.73 | 1.11 | 9.23 | .0005 | .47 | 3.71 | .0005 |
| 9 | 64 | 5.69 | 1.44 | 6.26 | 1.61 | 6.79 | 1.75 | 1.10 | 5.64 | .0005 | .53 | 2.63 | .01 |
| Total | 713 | 3.86 | 1.73 | 4.43 | 1.87 | 4.86 | 2.03 | 1.00 | 23.04 | .0005 | .43 | 9.53 | .0005 |

TABLE 11

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR ACTUAL AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED GAINS ON THE TOTAL READING SCORE OF THE METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST

| Grade | N | Pre-Test Mean | Pre-Test SD | Antic. Post-Test Mean | Antic. Post-Test SD | Actual Post-Test Mean | Actual Post-Test SD | Actual Gain | t-Ratio | p | Gain Above Antic. | t-Ratio | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 5 | 1.46 | .15 | 1.72 | .20 | 2.52 | .67 | 1.06 | 3.88 | .01 | .80 | 2.96 | .05 |
| 3 | 134 | 2.12 | .25 | 2.68 | .37 | 3.04 | .89 | .92 | 12.64 | .0005 | .36 | 4.84 | .0005 |
| 4 | 137 | 2.61 | .47 | 3.14 | .65 | 3.35 | .67 | .74 | 16.90 | .0005 | .21 | 4.43 | .0005 |
| 5 | 104 | 3.19 | .58 | 3.72 | .73 | 4.32 | .85 | 1.13 | 16.12 | .0005 | .60 | 8.16 | .0005 |
| 6 | 15 | 3.92 | .66 | 4.51 | .82 | 5.31 | .97 | 1.39 | 7.37 | .0005 | .80 | 4.04 | .01 |
| 7 | 90 | 4.44 | 1.04 | 5.00 | 1.22 | 5.71 | 1.25 | 1.27 | 12.27 | .0005 | .71 | 6.50 | .0005 |
| 8 | 164 | 5.28 | 1.10 | 5.88 | 1.27 | 6.48 | 1.42 | 1.20 | 13.80 | .0005 | .60 | 6.66 | .0005 |
| 9 | 64 | 5.59 | 1.27 | 6.14 | 1.42 | 6.74 | 1.49 | 1.15 | 7.27 | .0005 | .60 | 3.60 | .0005 |
| Total | 713 | 3.74 | 1.55 | 4.29 | 1.65 | 4.79 | 1.84 | 1.05 | 30.61 | .0005 | .50 | 13.91 | .0005 |

achievement in reading comprehension among children in grades 3 through 9 was significantly above that anticipated. Only the gain above anticipated t-ratio for second graders was not significant. However, the second graders in the evaluation sample did achieve an average of more than one year above anticipated in reading comprehension, suggesting that the sample was too small to allow the results to reach an acceptable level of significance.

Table 11 shows further the success of the program in helping children to achieve in reading at rates above those expected in a regular classroom program. It can be seen that pupils in the program achieved actual gains in total reading ranging from approximately seven months in the fourth grade to a year and four months in the sixth grade. Again, the second and fifth through ninth graders averaged a year or more gain in total reading achievement, while the third graders averaged nine months and the fourth graders averaged seven months gain. As the t-ratios for above anticipated gains indicate, the achievement of children at all grade levels in total reading was significantly above that anticipated for them based on their previous rate of growth.

Data in Tables 9, 10 and 11 suggest that the Corrective Reading Program was somewhat more effective in raising the reading achievement levels for fifth through ninth grade students than for third and fourth grade students. The findings do support the conclusion, however, that the Corrective Reading Program achieved

its first objective to improve participants' level of reading achievement beyond that which would be expected from the regular classroom program. This conclusion is supported further by the results of analyses of pre-and post-program grade level scores on the comprehension subtest of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. Table 12 shows the number and percentage of corrective reading students who achieved post-test scores below, the same as, and above expected in comprehension on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test.

TABLE 12

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS MAKING GAINS BELOW, THE SAME AS, AND ABOVE THE ANTICIPATED GRADE LEVEL SCORE ON THE STANFORD DIAGNOSTIC READING TEST

| Grade | N | Stanford Grade Score Below | Same | Above |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 5 | 1 (20) | 0 (0) | 4 (80) |
| 3 | 150 | 34 (23) | 10 (6) | 106 (71) |
| 4 | 142 | 41 (29) | 9 (6) | 92 (65) |
| 5 | 110 | 25 (23) | 12 (11) | 73 (66) |
| 6 | 23 | 9 (39) | 0 (0) | 14 (61) |
| 7 | 98 | 29 (30) | 6 (6) | 63 (64) |
| 8 | 166 | 56 (34) | 3 (2) | 107 (64) |
| 9 | 76 | 32 (42) | 0 (0) | 44 (58) |
| Total | 771 | 228 | 40 | 503 |
| Percent | | (30) | (5) | (65) |

Table 12 shows that more than 50 percent of the children at each grade level obtained actual post-test scores that were higher than their anticipated post-test scores. In the total corrective reading sample, 65 percent achieved above expected, five percent achieved the same as expected, and 30 percent achieved below expected in reading comprehension. These findings are comparable to those based on the comprehension subsection of the Metropolitan Achievement Test where 66 percent achieved above anticipated, three percent achieved the same as anticipated and 31 percent achieved below anticipated in reading comprehension (see Table 8).

Table 13 presents the means and the results of tests of significance for actual and above anticipated gains on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test grade level score for program participants' achievement in reading comprehension. It can be seen that children in the evaluation samples at each grade level, except the second and sixth grades, made gains significantly above those expected for them based on their previous performance. Since the second and sixth grade samples were substantially smaller than the samples at other grade levels it would be inappropriate to make any definitive statement about the program's effectiveness at these two grade levels. It should be noted that the children in the evaluation samples at these two grade levels also averaged gains in reading comprehension that were above their anticipated achievement levels, but not significantly above anticipated.

TABLE 13

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR ACTUAL AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED GAINS ON THE GRADE LEVEL SCORE OF THE STANFORD DIAGNOSTIC READING TEST

| Grade | N | Pre-Test Mean | SD | Antic. Post-Test Mean | SD | Actual Post-Test Mean | SD | Actual Gain | t-Ratio | p | Gain Above Antic. | t-Ratio | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 5 | 1.46 | .09 | 1.66 | .15 | 2.14 | .59 | .68 | 2.51 | .05 | .48 | 1.71 | NS |
| 3 | 150 | 1.87 | .38 | 2.25 | .55 | 2.59 | .56 | .72 | 18.15 | .0005 | .34 | 7.72 | .0005 |
| 4 | 142 | 2.26 | .52 | 2.63 | .69 | 2.95 | .67 | .69 | 15.91 | .0005 | .32 | 6.59 | .0005 |
| 5 | 110 | 2.77 | .58 | 3.17 | .74 | 3.42 | .78 | .65 | 11.46 | .0005 | .25 | 4.28 | .0005 |
| 6 | 23 | 3.81 | .80 | 4.36 | .98 | 4.57 | .89 | .76 | 4.86 | .0005 | .21 | 1.23 | NS |
| 7 | 98 | 4.24 | .95 | 4.73 | 1.11 | 5.24 | 1.42 | 1.00 | 9.26 | .0005 | .51 | 4.66 | .0005 |
| 8 | 166 | 4.83 | 1.19 | 5.35 | 1.38 | 5.88 | 1.79 | 1.05 | 10.70 | .0005 | .53 | 5.47 | .0005 |
| 9 | 77 | 4.78 | 1.36 | 5.21 | 1.53 | 5.62 | 1.76 | .84 | 5.90 | .0005 | .41 | 2.84 | .005 |
| Total | 771 | 3.35 | 1.49 | 3.79 | 1.64 | 4.18 | 1.83 | .83 | 25.19 | .0005 | .39 | 11.76 | .0005 |

In summary, the data in Table 13 further supports the conclusion that participants in the Corrective Reading Program, on the average, improved their reading achievement levels significantly.

2. Level of Retardation Group Results

The Corrective Reading Program in District 24 was structured so that elementary school students who were two or more years retarded in reading received three periods of instruction a week. Those who were between one and two years retarded in reading were given two periods of instruction a week. The two groups were compared to determine which group showed the greater gains in reading achievement.

Table 14 presents the number and percentage of more severely and less severely retarded readers in the program who obtained actual post-test scores above, the same as, and below anticipated on the word knowledge and reading comprehension subtests, and the total reading score of the Metropolitan Achievement Test, and the grade level comprehension score on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test.

TABLE 14

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF MORE SEVERELY AND LESS SEVERELY RETARDED ELEMENTARY PUPILS MAKING GAINS BELOW, THE SAME AS, AND ABOVE ANTICIPATED

| | | METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST | | | | | | | | | | STANFORD TEST | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Word Knowledge | | | Comprehension | | | Total Reading | | | | Grade Score | | | |
| Group | N | Below | Same | Above | Below | Same | Above | Below | Same | Above | N | Below | Same | Above | |
| More Severely Retarded | 231 | 57 | 10 | 164 | 64 | 9 | 158 | 55 | 14 | 162 | 248 | 47 | 18 | 183 | |
| % | | (25) | ( 4) | (71) | (28) | (4) | (68) | (24) | (6) | (70) | | (19) | (7) | (74) | |
| Less Severely Retarded | 159 | 44 | 9 | 106 | 55 | 8 | 96 | 41 | 11 | 107 | 169 | 59 | 13 | 97 | |
| % | | (28) | ( 5) | (67) | (35) | (5) | (60) | (26) | (7) | (67) | | (35) | (8) | (57) | |

As Table 14 shows, more than 50 percent, and often 60 to 70 percent of the children in the more severely and the less severely retarded reading groups made gains above expected in the areas measured. The data do indicate, however, that a greater percentage of the more severely retarded readers than the less severely retarded readers achieved above expected in word knowledge, reading comprehension, and total reading when measured by the Metropolitan Reading Test and in reading comprehension when measured by the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. The findings in Table 14 suggest that the program was more effective with the more seriously retarded readers than with the less seriously retarded readers. This is confirmed by the data in Table 15.

Table 15 presents the sample sizes, means and the results of tests of significance for the two groups' actual and above anticipated gains on the Metropolitan Achievement Test and the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. Although both groups achieved significantly above their expected levels in all areas, the more severely retarded readers averaged higher gains above anticipated than the less severely retarded readers. As the larger t-ratios for the more severely retarded group indicate, their gains in reading achievement were more significant than those of the less severely retarded group.

TABLE 15

COMPARISON OF GAINS OF MORE SEVERELY AND LESS SEVERELY RETARDED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PUPILS

| | N | Antic. Pre-Test Mean | Antic. Pre-Test SD | Actual Post-Test Mean | Actual Post-Test SD | Post-Test Mean | Post-Test SD | Actual Gain | t-Ratio | p | Gain Above Antic. | t-Ratio | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Metropolitan Achievement Test | | | | | | | |
| WORD KNOWLEDGE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| More Retarded | 231 | 2.58 | .72 | 3.09 | .84 | 3.58 | 1.17 | .99 | 16.11 | .0005 | .49 | 7.61 | .0005 |
| Less Retarded | 159 | 2.73 | .68 | 3.34 | .81 | 3.72 | .94 | .00 | 14.92 | .0005 | .38 | 5.33 | .0005 |
| COMPREHENSION | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| More Retarded | 231 | 2.57 | .79 | 3.06 | .95 | 3.49 | 1.12 | .92 | 17.05 | .0005 | .43 | 7.38 | .0005 |
| Less Retarded | 159 | 2.72 | .62 | 3.32 | .75 | 3.57 | .94 | .85 | 14.59 | .0005 | .25 | 3.92 | .0005 |
| TOTAL READING | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| More Retarded | 231 | 2.55 | .69 | 3.05 | .80 | 3.45 | 1.05 | .94 | 19.48 | .0005 | .44 | 8.80 | .0005 |
| Less Retarded | 159 | 2.69 | .56 | 3.29 | .65 | 3.62 | .91 | .93 | 16.61 | .0005 | .33 | 5.69 | .0005 |
| | | | | | | Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test | | | | | | | |
| GRADE LEVEL SCORE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| More Retarded | 248 | 2.21 | .72 | 2.55 | .86 | 2.93 | .83 | .72 | 21.17 | .0005 | .38 | 10.25 | .0005 |
| Less Retarded | 169 | 2.39 | .56 | 2.85 | .67 | 3.04 | .69 | .65 | 15.68 | .0005 | .19 | 4.40 | .0005 |

The data in Tables 14 and 15 support the conclusion that the program was more effective with the participants who were more severely retarded in reading at the beginning of the program than those who were less severely retarded. A similar finding was reported in last year's evaluation and it suggests again that the amount of improvement in reading achievement is directly related to the amount of instruction provided.

Growth in Specific Reading Skills. The second objective of the District 24 Corrective Reading Program was to provide individualized instruction so that participants would increase their performance in specific reading skills. The measure used to evaluate this objective was the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. Level I of this test was administered to participants in grades 2 through 4 and to some students in the higher grades whose previous reading achievement levels indicated this was the appropriate test. The Level II test was administered to children in grades 5 through 9. Pre-program scores on this test were made available to the Corrective Reading Teachers to use in diagnosing pupil weaknesses and planning instruction. The pre- and post-test means and gain scores are shown in Table 16, for specified skill areas.

TABLE 16

PRE- TO POST-TEST GAINS ON SUBTESTS OF THE STANFORD DIAGNOSTIC READING TEST

| | Pre-Test | | Post-Test | | | t- |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Gain | Ratio* |
| | Level I Stanford Test (N=395) | | | | | |
| 1. Reading Comprehension | 22.37 | 9.43 | 31.34 | 7.67 | 8.97 | 26.34 |
| 2. Vocabulary | 15.06 | 5.39 | 20.55 | 7.25 | 5.49 | 17.77 |
| 3. Auditory Discrimination | 26.87 | 10.99 | 35.56 | 8.86 | 8.68 | 16.77 |
| 4. Syllabication | 10.10 | 3.55 | 13.38 | 4.09 | 3.28 | 15.48 |
| 5. Beginning and Ending Sounds | 22.22 | 6.47 | 29.03 | 5.10 | 6.81 | 25.38 |
| 6. Blending | 18.54 | 8.77 | 26.59 | 7.24 | 8.05 | 25.80 |
| 7. Sound Discrimination | 14.97 | 6.81 | 20.50 | 7.70 | 5.53 | 18.84 |
| | Level II Stanford Test (N=234) | | | | | |
| 1. (a) Literal Comprehension | 16.14 | 4.27 | 18.91 | 4.35 | 2.77 | 13.56 |
| (b) Inferential Comprehension | 13.66 | 4.85 | 16.71 | 6.07 | 3.05 | 9.42 |
| (c) Total Comprehension | 29.89 | 8.66 | 35.42 | 8.69 | 5.53 | 14.45 |
| 2. Vocabulary | 21.95 | 5.28 | 24.98 | 5.38 | 3.03 | 12.74 |
| 3. Syllabication | 14.57 | 4.06 | 16.12 | 3.78 | 1.55 | 8.01 |
| 4. Sound Discrimination | 18.86 | 6.23 | 21.40 | 6.08 | 2.54 | 10.48 |
| 5. Blending | 21.18 | 8.47 | 25.56 | 7.64 | 4.38 | 15.63 |
| 6. Rate | 17.87 | 8.52 | 19.48 | 8.63 | 1.61 | 3.06 |

*All t-ratios significant at .005

The t-ratios in Table 16 show that the pre-to post-program gains in each skill area were significant at the .005 level. The skill areas in which the most significant gains were made on Level I of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test are reading comprehension, beginning and ending sounds and blending. The skill areas in which the most significant gains were made on Level II of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test are blending, total comprehension, literal comprehension and vocabulary. The least significant gains were made in rate of reading on the Level II test and sound discrimination on the Level I test. The younger children in the program made gains that were generally more significant than those made by the older groups.

The data presented in Table 16 support the conclusion that the second objective of the District 24 Corrective Reading Program to increase participants' performance in specific reading skills was achieved. Although no comparisons of gains in specific skills were made with groups not receiving the specialized instruction, controlled comparisons were made for the preceding objective related to total reading achievement. The inference can be made that the gains reported here in specific skills are reflective of the total reading achievement gains and that control group comparisons would parallel the findings presented in the preceding section on reading achievement.

Improvement in Reading Attitude. The third objective of the District 24 Corrective Reading Program was to improve program participants' attitude toward reading. Progress toward this goal was measured by a pre- and post-program administration of the Reading Attitude Index (see Appendix E). The scale on this instrument is constructed so that a lower score reflects a more positive attitude toward reading than a higher score. Therefore, an improvement in reading attitude would be indicated by a decrease in students' post-test scores. The pre- and post-test means, difference scores and the t-ratios are presented in Table 17.

TABLE 17

PRE- TO POST-PROGRAM CHANGES IN STATE URBAN STUDENTS' READING ATTITUDE*

| | | Pre-Index | | Post-Index | | | t- | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | N | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Diff. | Ratio | p |
| 2 | 5 | 38.80 | 8.64 | 42.60 | 9.45 | +3.80 | 1.21 | NS |
| 3 | 142 | 42.04 | 9.07 | 40.92 | 8.31 | -1.12 | 1.42 | NS |
| 4 | 113 | 40.37 | 8.66 | 39.62 | 9.24 | -0.75 | 0.84 | NS |
| 5 | 105 | 41.48 | 7.74 | 40.13 | 7.47 | -1.35 | 1.63 | NS |
| 6 | 23 | 38.64 | 7.86 | 42.09 | 6.91 | +3.45 | 1.93 | .05 |
| 7 | 76 | 41.14 | 7.89 | 41.01 | 7.14 | -0.13 | 0.16 | NS |
| 8 | 112 | 42.68 | 7.85 | 42.47 | 9.12 | -0.21 | 0.26 | NS |
| 9 | 59 | 44.83 | 9.09 | 45.69 | 9.74 | +0.86 | 0.73 | NS |
| Total Group | 634 | 41.77 | 8.46 | 41.34 | 8.60 | - .43 | 1.23 | |

*A decrease in the Reading Attitude Index score represents an improvement in reading attitude.

NS=Not statistically significant at .05

The t-ratios presented in Table 17 show that there were no significant changes in program participants' attitude toward reading except at the sixth grade. The direction of the change, it should be noted, is toward a more negative attitude toward reading among sixth graders.

The data presented here should be viewed in relation to the data presented earlier in Tables 10, 11 and 13. The data presented there show that sixth graders made the least significant gains in total reading and reading comprehension on the Metropolitan Achievement Test and that sixth graders made no significant gains above those anticipated for them on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. It is evident that the Corrective Reading Program was least effective at the sixth grade for producing change in reading achievement and significantly less effective at the sixth grade for producing improvement in attitude toward reading.

The data presented in Table 17 support the conclusion that the goal of improving program participants' attitude toward reading was not achieved. These data indicate that sixth graders' attitude toward reading became significantly more negative.

Inferences can be drawn from these results which suggest that the Corrective Reading Program in District 24 successfully teaches students how to read but it does little to hlep them enjoy reading. The significant gains reported for growth in

total reading achievement and specific skills do not result in a parallel improvement in students' attitude toward reading. The long term effects of such a corrective reading program should be considered in evaluating its effectiveness. Furthermore, the causes for not affecting students' positive attitude toward reading while increasing their ability to read should be investigated. Perhaps the reasons lie in the emphasis on the specific skills taught and in the content of the materials used. While reports of materials used in the program included some interesting literature for children, the amount was minimal in relation to other materials used.

Impact of Paraprofessionals. The final objective of the District 24 Corrective Reading Program was to increase individualization of instruction for program participants through the services of paraprofessionals as a means of increasing pupil growth in reading. In order to determine the impact of paraprofessional services, the evaluation plan called for a comparison between students in the reimburseable Corrective Reading Program and students in a parallel tax levy program that did not use the services of paraprofessionals. A change was made in the tax levy program, however, and a full time paraprofessional was assigned to each tax levy reading teacher in March of the school year. Since the tax levy program included paraprofessional services

for only one to one and a half months before the post-test was administered in April, compared to the seven to seven and a half months in the State Urban Education Program, the decision was made to proceed with the planned comparison.

The comparisons between the State Urban Education Corrective Reading Program with seven and a half months of paraprofessional service and the tax levy corrective reading program with one and a half months of paraprofessional service were made on the total reading score of the Metropolitan Achievement Test and the grade level score on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test as well as on attitude toward reading. The results of the analysis of covariance are presented in Table 18.

TABLE 18

COMPARISON OF STATE URBAN PROGRAM WITH TAX LEVY PROGRAM

| Group | N | Pre-Mean | Post-Mean | Adj. Post | df | F-Ratio | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Reading (Metropolitan) | | | | | | | |
| State Urban | 390 | 2.61 | 3.54 | 3.66 | 1/670 | 3.73 | NS |
| Tax Levy | 283 | 3.93 | 3.77 | 3.77 | | | |
| Grade Level Score (Stanford) | | | | | | | |
| State Urban | 417 | 2.28 | 2.97 | 3.07 | 1/688 | 4.02 | .05 |
| Tax Levy | 274 | 2.57 | 3.32 | 3.17 | | | |
| Reading Attitude | | | | | | | |
| State Urban | 375 | 41.31 | 40.40 | 40.15 | 1/610 | 9.08 | .01 |
| Tax Levy | 238 | 39.66 | 41.71 | 42.11 | | | |

The F-ratios shown in Table 18 reveal that, when pre-test group differences were controlled, there were no significant differences between the post-test scores of the State Urban Education students and the tax levy students in total reading achievement as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test. There were differences, however, on the post-test scores of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test in favor of the tax levy students. The results indicate that the addition of paraprofessional services did not significantly increase pupils' growth in reading achievement.

There was some indication, as the data in Table 18 show, that students in the State Urban Education Program with more paraprofessional services show significantly more improvement in their attitudes toward reading than students in the tax levy program. It is difficult to conclude, however, that this change in attitude is directly attributable to the services provided by paraprofessionals. However, it is possible that the additional contact provided by the paraprofessionals had a favorable effect on students' attitude toward the program and, therefore, their attitude toward reading generally.

In summary, the data support the conclusion that the addition of paraprofessional services does not significantly increase pupils' growth in reading achievement. The tenuous nature of this conclusion must be recognized, however, since

there was evidence that the paraprofessionals were not primarily involved in instructional roles. Therefore, it would be unlikely that their presence would have a direct effect on pupil achievement as it was proposed in the program objective. If paraprofessional services are proposed as a means of increasing individualization of instruction in order to directly affect pupil growth in reading, the paraprofessional role needs to be clearly defined as instructional in nature. When paraprofessionals do assume roles directly related to instruction, then it would be appropriate to assess the impact of their services on pupil achievement.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The summary and conclusions are arranged in an order corresponding to the presentation of the report.

Growth in Reading Achievement. The first objective of the Corrective Reading Program was to improve participants' level of reading achievement beyond that which would be expected from the regular classroom program. Pre- and post-program scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test and the grade level scores on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test were used to determine if this objective was achieved. Based on each child's previous rate of growth, anticipated post-test scores were determined as a measure of how well the child would have achieved if he had not received special reading instruction. At the end of the program, the child's actual post-test performance was compared to his anticipated performance to see if the actual gains made were larger than those anticipated.

The data presented in this report support the conclusion that the program was successful in achieving its objective. The following findings support that conclusion.

1. When actual post-test performance was compared to anticipated performance, more than 50 percent of the students at each grade level and the total group made gains above expected in word knowledge, reading comprehension and total reading on the Metropolitan Achievement Test and the comprehension subtest of the

Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test. In fact, in total reading achievement, 69 percent achieved above expected, seven percent the same as expected and 24 percent below expected.

2. Grade level comparisons showed that the gains made above those anticipated in word knowledge, comprehension and total reading on the Metropolitan Achievement Test were statistically significant for all grade levels, except the second grade where students' achievement in comprehension was greater than expected but not significantly greater. The same comparisons for scores on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test indicated that students in all grade levels, except those in the second and sixth grades, made gains significantly above those expected in reading comprehension based on their previous rate of growth. The lower gains among second and sixth graders may be accounted for by the relatively small number of students in the evaluation samples. The second and sixth grade students in the evaluation sample did make average gains that were higher than expected but these gains were not significantly higher than expected.

3. Comparisons of the gains of the more severely and less severely retarded readers revealed that more than 50 percent, and often 60 to 70 percent, of the students in each group made gains above expected in all areas of reading measured. A greater percentage, however, of the more severely retarded readers achieved above expected gains in word knowledge, comprehension and total reading as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test and the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test.

4. Although both the more severely and the less severely retarded readers made reading achievement gains significantly above those anticipated for them, there was evidence the more serverely retarded readers made greater gains than the less severely retarded readers. These findings suggest that the program was more successful with students who were more severely retarded in reading at the beginning of the program. Similar findings were reported in the 1971-72 evaluation and suggest again that the amount of improvement in reading is directly related to the amount of instruction provided.

Growth in Specific Reading Skills. The second objective of the District 24 Corrective Reading Program was to provide individualized instruction so that participants would increase their performance in specific reading skills. Pre-test and post-test scores on the appropriate level of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test were used to determine if this objective was achieved.

The data presented in this report support the conclusion that the program was successful in increasing participants' performance in specific reading skills. The following finding supports that conclusion.

1. When pre-test and post-test scores on the appropriate level of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test were compared, gains in all skill areas were significant. Younger students in

the program made gains that were generally more significant than gains made by older students in the program.

Improvement in Reading Attitude. The third objective of the Corrective Reading Program was to improve program participants' attitude toward reading. Pre-program and post-program scores on the Reading Attitude Index were used to assess progress toward this objective.

The data presented in this report support the conclusion that the program was not successful in improving program participants' attitude toward reading. The following finding supports that conclusion.

When pre-program and post-program scores on the Reading Attitude Index were compared, attitude toward reading was no more positive at the end of the program than it was at the beginning for students at any grade level. Students in the sixth grade became significantly less positive in their attitude toward reading during the year.

Impact of Paraprofessionals. The final objective of the Corrective Reading Program was to increase individualization of instruction for program participants through the services of paraprofessionals as a means of increasing pupil growth in reading. Comparisons were made between the performance of students in the State Urban Education Corrective Reading Program and that of students in the tax levy corrective reading program.

The data presented in this report support the conclusion that the addition of paraprofessional services did not significantly increase pupils' growth in reading achievement and, therefore, the program objective was not achieved. Students in the State Urban Education Program did show improvement in their attitude toward reading, however. The following findings support the conclusions stated above.

1. When pre-test and post-test scores of students in the State Urban Education Corrective Reading Program were compared to pre-test and post-test scores for students in the tax levy corrective reading program, no significant differences were found in total reading achievement as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

2. When pre-test and post-test scores of students in the State Urban Education Corrective Reading Program were compared to pre-test and post-test scores for students in the tax levy corrective reading program, significant differences were found in reading comprehension as measured by the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test which favored the tax levy students.

3. Attitude toward reading scores of the State Urban Education Corrective Reading Program participants on the Reading Attitude Index were significantly more positive than those of students in the tax levy corrective reading program. It is

difficult to attribute the changes in attitude toward reading to the addition of paraprofessional services since the role of the paraprofessional is not clearly evident in teachers' reports of paraprofessionals' duties.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The evidence presented in this report points to the general success of the Corrective Reading Program in affecting significant student progress in basic reading skills and total reading achievement. Thus, the following recommendations are offered as guidelines for further improving and refining the program now in operation.

1. There were nearly one-third of the program participants who were achieved at less than their expected rate of growth. This may be due to weaknesses in diagnostic procedures and the prescriptive instruction used for these children. Every effort should be made to determine the causes for the low achievement of this group as a means of improving the reading instruction for all children.

2. Since the program has been successful in improving basic reading skills among a large proportion of the population, efforts should now be made to move these students toward increased reading comprehension and higher level critical reading skills. Programmatic efforts could include increased use of a variety of

high interest materials and improved teaching skill for the development of interpretive, inferential, analytical and evaluative reading skills. The intent of such efforts would be not only to increase students' reading proficiency but their enjoyment of reading as well. There was evidence that this important corollary objective was not achieved in the current program.

3. The district staff should seriously weigh the gains to be derived from inclusion of second graders in the Corrective Reading Program. On the basis of the selection instruments and criteria used in this program, it is highly inappropriate to include second graders. It is recommended that the program be limited to students in grades 3 through 9. If early identification of reading or other learning disabilities becomes a goal for District 24, careful study will need to be made of the concomitant implications for screening, selection, program and evaluation procedures.

4. There was again evidence that the amount of improvement in reading achievement was related to the amount of instruction received. Therefore, the staff should continue to accurately assign the more severely retarded readers to the instructional groups that meet more frequently.

5. There was evidence that the level of professional preparation among the reading teachers was higher than the preceding

year. This is a desirable trend and the district should make every effort to continue to recruit qualified specialists for the program. However, the number of students who are still not achieving above their previous rate of growth and the need to expand the achievement of those who are making gains above expected to include higher level reading skills do point to the need for continued inservice training that emphasizes the goals of this program.

6. If the objective to provide paraprofessional services as a means of increasing student achievement in reading is to be continued, changes must be made in the role presently assumed by paraprofessionals. The paraprofessionals' role should be defined as primarily instructional; they should receive adequate training for the role, and the reading teachers should be adequately prepared to effectively use the paraprofessionals in the instructional program. If paraprofessionals are not used in instructional roles, then this aspect of the program should be reassessed.

7. Provision must be made for adequate time for reading teachers to confer with parents and classroom teachers who should play a significant cooperative role in the resolution of reading problems.

8. The district staff should continue in the direction of providing adequate diagnostic and prescriptive instruction in the developmental reading program so that the separate Corrective

Reading Program can be phased out. This will permit the reading specialists in each school to become reading resource teachers and teacher trainers who can offer classroom teachers specialized assistance in developing their reading programs.

# ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

## PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of the State Urban English as a Second Language (ESL) Program was to increase the ability of non-native speaking pupils to understand and speak English.

A corollary objective of the program was to move ESL students toward the acquisition of reading and writing skills in English as readiness is attained.

## EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

In order to assess program effectiveness, the following evaluation objective was used:

Given ratings of students' oral fluency in English on a pre-and post-program basis, pupils will manifest significant gains in their ability to use English.

## METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

Two measures were used to assess pupil growth in English as a second language. The "A to F" Scale for Rating Oral Language Ability of Pupils (see Appendix A) provided a measure of pupils' productive facility in English and is based on teacher ratings of children's oral skills in several language areas. The Linguistic Capacity Index, developed at the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, was used as a measure of the pupils' receptive competence in English. Both tests were administered to students on a pre- and post-program basis.

Observations of the instructional program were made by the evaluation team using the ESL Observation Checklist (see Appendix B), and interviews were held with the program coordinator.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM IN OPERATION

The English as a Second Language (ESL) Program was designed to service children in the target population in seven schools in District 24. Table 1 lists the schools and the number of teachers in the State Urban ESL Program.

TABLE 1

SCHOOLS AND NUMBER OF TEACHERS
IN THE ESL PROGRAM

| School | Level | No. of Teachers |
|---|---|---|
| P.S. 19 | Elementary | 2 |
| P.S. 89 | Elementary | 3 |
| P.S. 143 | Elementary | 1 |
| P.S. 199 | Elementary | 1 |
| I.S. 61 | Intermediate | 2 |
| J.H. 73 | Junior High | 1 |
| J.H. 125 | Junior High | 1 |
| | Total | 11 |

Program Design. Based on recommendations from the previous year's evaluation, an effort was made to design a carefully planned program that was structured to provide students with consistent and intensive daily instruction over the entire treatment period. The proposed design called for 48 pupils to

be serviced by each of the elementary ESL teachers and 50 to be serviced by each of the teachers in the intermediate and junior high schools. Thus, a total of 536 children were to be serviced by the program, 336 elementary and 200 secondary students.

At each elementary school, each teacher was to divide the 48 students into three groups. Two groups of 16 pupils each were to meet five times a week in one and a half hour sessions for a total of seven and a half hours of instruction each week. These 32 pupils were to be drawn from among students in the target population who were rated lowest (categories "F," "E," and "D") in English proficiency based on the Scale for Rating Oral Language Ability of Students. The third group of 16 pupils was to meet four times a week for one hour and 15-minute sessions, a total of five hours of instruction weekly. This group was to include students in categories "F," "D," and "E" who could not be serviced in the first two groups. Remaining places could be used to service students who were rated "C" in English oral fluency.

At the intermediate and junior high schools, the design called for each teacher to divide the 50 pupils into five groups of ten students each. Each group would meet for 45 minutes per day, five days a week, a total of three hours and 45 minutes of instruction weekly. Three of the five groups were to be comprised of students most in need of instruction in English, those rated "F," "E," then "D" on the oral language scale. The remaining two groups were to be selected primarily from the "D" then "C" category.

In schools not eligible for Title I services, there were three 45-minute periods set aside for providing additional individualized instruction during the week to small groups of five pupils who were most in need of instruction, those at the "F" fluency level. Teachers in these schools had two preparation periods a week for program related activities such as lesson planning, screening, placement and orientation of new pupils, record keeping, administering tests, and conferences with teachers, parents, guidance counselors and supervisors. In the schools eligible for Title I services (P.S. 19, P.S. 143, and I.S. 61), the design called for five preparation periods per week in accordance with the contract with the United Federation of Teachers; however, teachers could utilize these periods to provide additional instruction to small groups of children in the "F" language category.

The program was coordinated by the District English as a Second Language specialist who was responsible for conducting monthly inservice training sessions and for providing ongoing program supervision.

Program Implementation. Examination of class rosters, observations in the schools, and conferences with the staff revealed that the ESL Program was not implemented according to the original design described above. Scheduling difficulties, the number of students considered actually in need of instruction

versus the number planned for, the fluctuation in the target population, and administrative preferences were factors which brought about substantial changes in the structure of the program at each school.

In general, the changes made at the elementary schools meant that each teacher had more instructional groups, of varying sizes, meeting different amounts of time during the week than originally planned. Most of the elementary teachers taught five groups of children instead of three but two teachers had six groups and another had seven. Instructional groups varied in size from six to 18 children. While in some schools all groups had the same amount of instruction (e.g. 45 minutes per day, five days a week) regardless of oral fluency level, in other schools instructional time varied according to fluency level. For example, in one elementary school two groups of "F" rated children met five days a week in one and a half hour sessions for a total of seven and a half hours of instruction weekly as called for in the design; however, two groups of primarily "E" rated children met only twice a week in 30 minute periods for a total of one hour of instruction, and another group of "E" rated children met once a week for a total of only 30 minutes of instruction weekly.

Similarly,changes were made at the secondary schools. Teachers serviced from three to five groups ranging in size from ten to 23 students. In general, instructional groups rated

lowest ("F" or "E") on the oral fluency scale received the most instruction, up to seven hours a week, and those rated highest ("D" or "C") received the least, about one and a half hours a week.

The modifications that were made in the program design did result in a larger number of students being serviced by the program than originally planned. However, the changes also meant that the average amount of time each student received instruction in English was diminished considerably. Clearly, the District 24 staff must study and weigh the gains to be derived from servicing a large number of students with less instruction against the gains derived from providing a smaller number of students with more instruction.

Another problem encountered in the program relates to the relatively high degree of mobility in the program population. As children who spoke no English were admitted to the school, it was necessary to transfer program participants to other ESL classes, if they were available, or to move students into mainstream classrooms in order to provide new arrivals with needed instruction in English. In addition, a number of students' families moved and their places in the program were filled by new arrivals or other non-native speakers from the school population.

To determine the extent of mobility in the program population, the evaluation team established a system whereby teachers were to submit a New Entrant, Exit, or Transfer Information Form

(see Appendices C, D and E) when a program participant's status was changed. Data from these records revealed that 30 to 50 percent of each teacher's original group was exited from the program or transferred to other ESL groups, and replaced by new entrants.

The transient nature of the non-English speaking populations in New York City is well known and presents a difficult problem for those trying to design instructional programs for children from these populations. In District 24, instability in the program population further reduced the amount of instructional time students received. Often children had to be moved into mainstream classrooms before they had sufficient proficiency in English to successfully achieve in the regular classroom program.

Instructional Program. In order to evaluate the quality of the classroom instruction, observations were made by an ESL specialist on eleven ESL teachers in the program. The ESL Observation Checklist (see Appendix B) was used to record ratings of specific instructional behaviors and the ratings of student behaviors. The scale used to indicate the quality of behaviors observed ranged from 0 to 4. Items on the scale which did not occur in the observation period were categorized as not applicable (NA). On the scale, 0=unacceptable, 1=barely acceptable, 2=acceptable, 3=good, and 4=excellent. In order to determine which instructional behaviors were used most effectively, a rank order of the ratings for each behavior was established from the

mean ratings for the eleven ESL teachers. These data indicate specific behaviors that were observed and the rating of the quality of the behaviors observed. Behaviors that were not observed were tallied in the N/A category. The rank order and mean ratings of the observed instructional behaviors appear in Table 2.

TABLE 2

RANK ORDER AND MEAN RATING FOR OBSERVED INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAVIORS IN ESL CLASSES

| Rank | Behavior | Frequency N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Mean Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Knowledge and Use of student names | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 4.00 |
| 2 | Ask question, then call on student | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 3.90 |
| 3 | Repetition after the teacher model | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3.63 |
| 4 | Attitude/Manner | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 3.45 |
| 5 | How well was "previously learned" material practiced, reviewed & reinforced? | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3.40 |
| 6 | Was the model appropriate for correct responses? | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3.11 |
| 7 | Speech Pattern: colloquial; normal classroom speed | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3.10 |
| 8 | How well was new material introduced? | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3.00 |
| 8 | Did teacher recognize difference between teaching & testing? | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3.00 |
| 8 | Distribution of student participation among group. Are all students participating? | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3.00 |
| 8 | How well was material practiced after introduction? | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3.00 |
| 8 | How well were corrections made? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3.00 |
| 8 | How much practice with new materials? | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3.00 |

| Rank | Behavior | Frequency N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Mean Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | How well was at-home follow-up accomplished? | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3.00 |
| 9 | Awareness of student needs | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2.91 |
| 10 | Response to language cues? | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2.86 |
| 11 | Instructions and Cueing: Did students know what teacher expected? | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2.82 |
| 12 | Was focus of lesson clear? | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2.73 |
| 12 | How effective was individual practice? | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2.73 |
| 12 | How well were audio visual aids employed? | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2.73 |
| 13 | How well did teacher proceed from simple to complex? | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2.71 |
| 14 | Did lesson have a beginning, a middle, and an end? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2.54 |
| 15 | How well did teacher proceed from concrete to abstract? | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2.50 |
| 15 | How well were students' questions answered by the teacher? | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 |
| 16 | How did teacher evaluate student comprehension & progress? | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2.44 |
| 17 | How well did teacher proceed from known to unknown? | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2.43 |
| 18 | How well did teacher proceed from receptive to productive? | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2.38 |
| 19 | How effective was choral practice? | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2.36 |
| 20 | How well were explanations made? | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2.33 |
| 20 | How well was drill extended into communication? | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2.33 |
| 21 | How effective was practice in speaking? | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2.30 |
| 22 | How effective was practice in listening | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2.27 |
| 23 | Variety of activities/change of pace | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2.09 |
| 24 | How effective was practice in reading? | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 |

| Rank | Behavior | Frequency N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Mean Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24 | How well did teacher proceed from manipulation to communication? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2.00 |
| 25 | How much did the teacher talk? Ratio of teacher/student talk? | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1.82 |
| 26 | Initiation of communication situations by students? | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1.56 |
| 27 | How effective was practice in writing? | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | .50 |
| 28 | If teacher used student's native language, how effectively was it done? | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ---- |

Scale: N/A=Not applicable
0=Unacceptable
1=Barely acceptable
2=Acceptable
3=Good
4=Excellent

It is evident in Table 2 that the two instructional behaviors that were used most effectively were calling students by name and asking questions and then calling on students. A teaching behavior more unique to ESL instruction "repetition after the teacher model" was the next most effectively used behavior. The 3.63 mean rating indicates that the eight teachers who used this procedure (three N/A did not use it ), used it well. These ratings suggest that teacher modeling and student repetition are procedures that have been stressed in the background and/or inservice training of the ESL teachers.

The next group of instructional behaviors that were rated good to excellent cover a variety of factors. The attitude/

manner item, rated 3.45, was supported in the narrative description made by the evaluation team ESL specialist. The comment "With very few exceptions,the teachers seemed interested in their students and in their work. Classroom rapport and empathy were widely noticeable," parallels the high rating in Table 2. Reinforcement, practice and review of previously learned materials was demonstrated as an instructional behavior by ten of the 11 teachers observed and was rated good to excellent by the observer (3.40). These instructional behaviors, too, have obviously been stressed in the training provided for the ESL teachers.

The items rated at 3.00 and above include appropriate modeling, rate and style of speech pattern, introduction of new material, differences between teaching and testing, distribution of student participation, practice of new material, the manner of correcting students, and at-home work follow-up. These instructional behaviors were generally observed and were considered by the observer to be effectively used. The frequencies listed in the N/A category should be noted, however, for seven of the 11 teachers did not evidence behaviors that suggested any at-home follow-up of English activities that were assigned to their students.

Most of the other instructional behaviors observed were rated acceptable (2.00) to good (3.00) and cover a variety of factors. Items that were rated 2.00 or lower need to be examined

since several of these behaviors are integrally linked to the objectives for the program. For example, practice in reading (rank ordered 24th) was used by only two of the 11 ESL teachers. Similarly, writing practice was used by only two of the 11 ESL teachers. Although acquisition of reading and writing skills was only a corollary objective for the program, it appears that very few teachers attempted to include reading and writing activities at all. This is particularly noteworthy since the observations were made late in the school year and it seems likely that some students would be ready for practice in reading and writing English. Teachers' use of students' native language was another practice totally avoided by all teachers. Theoretical differences about this practice still exist, yet these teachers all seem to accept the non-use of students' native language position.

The second section of the ESL Observation Checklist focuses on student behaviors observed in ESL classes. The same 0 to 4 rating scale used to assess the quality of the teacher behaviors is used to assess the quality of student behaviors. The summary of the ratings of student behaviors observed in 11 ESL classrooms appears in Table 3.

TABLE 3

RANK ORDER AND MEAN RATINGS FOR OBSERVED STUDENT BEHAVIORS IN ESL CLASSES

| Rank | Behavior | Frequency N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Mean Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Did students seem to understand the teacher? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 3.64 |
| 2 | How effective was individual student participation in repition? | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3.44 |
| 3 | What was level of student interest? | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 3.36 |
| 3 | What was student attitude toward materials? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 3.36 |
| 4 | Did students seem to understand the material? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3.27 |
| 4 | What was the classroom atmosphere & the rapport among students? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 3.27 |
| 4 | How effective was individual student response? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3.27 |
| 5 | Did students correct each other? | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 |
| 6 | Did students use English outside of lesson framework? | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1.67 |
| 7 | How effective was individual student initiated talk? | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1.40 |

Scale: N/A=Not applicable
0=unacceptable
1=barely acceptable
2=acceptable
3=good
4=excellent

The ratings seen in Table 3 indicate that all items of student behaviors, except three, were rated good to excellent. The students were judged by the ESL specialist observer to understand their teachers and the material, to participate in repetition, to be interested and to demonstrate a positive attitude toward

their classroom. The three items which were rated low on the scale are related to student interaction, student initiated talk and use of English outside the lesson framework. These data suggest that the teachers are adept in teacher directed activities but perhaps need additional training in facilitating student interaction.

An additional factor that must be considered in interpretation of the teacher and student ratings was observed by the ESL specialist. The observer noted that some students attended two ESL classes during different periods of the day with different teachers. The observer noted that students were being introduced to the same material without relating the instruction to what had been introduced in the other class by another teacher. The ESL specialist recommended a developmental sequence of instruction for successive levels of language learning and observed that the practice of overlapping and duplication mitigated against it.

The observations also revealed that practically no work was being done in connection with reading comprehension and that no reading books of any kind were in evidence. Furthermore, writing was limited to copying sentences and a few fill-in-the-blank exercises. Also missing from the classes was any type of listening comprehension exercises. These observations suggest that the primary approach used in the ESL program is restricted to a limited use of English, that is, production of the language in carefully structured forms.

The ESL specialist also observed that not enough of the teachers avail themselves of the wealth of materials available to them. This may be simply uneasiness with something new, lack of imagination in the use of materials or insufficient training. The observations and the ratings combine to indicate a need to expand concepts about second language instruction as well as a need to expand the goals of the program beyond oral language production.

In order to examine more carefully the results of the classroom observation data, individual teacher and student group behaviors were tallied. The mean ratings for each teacher and student group observed appear in Table 4.

TABLE 4

OVERALL RATINGS OF TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

| Teacher No. | Average Ratings: Instructional Behaviors | Average Ratings: Student Behaviors |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3.85 | 4.00 |
| 2 | 3.81 | 3.75 |
| 3 | 3.32 | 3.00 |
| 4 | 3.13 | 3.38 |
| 5 | 2.97 | 3.50 |
| 6 | 2.62 | 3.00 |
| 7 | 2.59 | 3.10 |
| 8 | 2.53 | 2.25 |
| 9 | 2.50 | 3.14 |
| 10 | 1.52 | 1.71 |
| 11 | 1.48 | 2.50 |

Scale: N/A=Not applicable
1=barely acceptable
2=acceptable
3=good
4=excellent

The ratings presented in Table 4 show that four teachers were rated good to excellent, five teachers were rated acceptable to good, and two teachers were rated barely acceptable to acceptable. These ratings strongly suggest that expanded in-service training of ESL teachers is warranted.

The ESL specialist observed that ESL teachers in the elementary grades appeared to be more effective than junior high school teachers. The evaluators avoided presentation of the data separated by grade level to maintain anonymity for the ESL teachers observed.

EFFECTS OF PROGRAM ON CHILDREN

Data collected from teacher records indicated that 15 different native languages were represented by students in the State Urban ESL Program. The majority of the children, 84 percent, were Spanish speaking children. District 24's aim is to develop non-native speaker's language facility in English so that they will be able to function adequately in school. To this end, the oral-aural approach was emphasized in teaching English as a second language. This section of the report presents data on the children's growth in English language skills.

Two measures were used to assess the extent to which the program objective was achieved. The results are based on data for all children in the program for whom pre- and post-program

scores were available on both of the evaluation measures. Complete data were available for a total of 416 pupils.

Productive English Language Proficiency. To assess children's growth in productive English language skills, teacher ratings on the Oral Language Ability Scale (OLAS) were used. This scale is a modification of the "A-F" New York City Board of Education Language Rating Scale which was prepared and tested last year by the District ESL staff. Each child is individually tested and rated in five language areas: structural patterns, vocabulary, pronunciation, situation interpretation, and intonation (see Appendix A). In each area the child is rated on a six-point scale from A=6 to F=0 with "F" representing "Speaks No English." The ratings in each area are summed and divided by five to obtain the child's English oral fluency score.

The Oral Language Ability Scale (OLAS) was used initially to screen children in the target population at each school. Children in the "F" to "C" category were selected for the program, however, pupils in the lowest categories were to receive priority. Teachers' pre-program ratings on the OLAS were compared to post-program ratings for evaluation purposes. Because no control group was available for comparison, a groups by test analysis was done in order to derive as much information from the data collected as possible. The subjects were divided into three groups: the first group included children in grades kindergarten to three,

the second group included grades 4 to 6, and the third group included grades 7 to 9.

The sample sizes, pre-and post-program mean ratings, the mean gains and the results of the analysis of variance for each OLAS language area and the total OLAS oral fluency score are presented in Table 5.

The mean data in Table 5 reveal a language learning pattern that is fairly consistent across each subsection and the total oral fluency score on the OLAS. This pattern shows the youngest children, grades K to 3, to be the least skilled in English and the oldest children to be the most skilled at the beginning of the program. However, the post means show that by the end of the program children in each of the three grade groups were similar in each of the skill areas measured, suggesting systematic differences in language learning among the three groups. As the mean gain data indicate, the kindergarten to grade 3 group made the greatest gains in all but one area, the fourth to sixth grade group made the next highest gains, and the junior high school students in grades 7 through 9 made the lowest gains. The systematic nature of the differences in growth in English among the three groups is further confirmed by the results of the analyses of variance.

TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF GAINS ON THE ENGLISH ORAL LANGUAGE ABILITY SCALE (OLAS)

| Grade Levels | N | Pre-Mean | Post-Mean | Gain | Analysis of Variance Results: Source | df | F-Ratio | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Structural Patterns** | | | | | | | | |
| K-3 | 132 | .87 | 2.25 | 1.38 | Groups(G) | 2/413 | 14.54 | .001 |
| 4-6 | 215 | 1.26 | 2.46 | 1.20 | Tests (T) | 1/413 | 614.97 | .001 |
| 7-9 | 69 | 1.83 | 2.45 | .62 | GxT | 2/413 | 14.57 | .001 |
| **Vocabulary** | | | | | | | | |
| K-3 | 132 | 1.15 | 2.52 | 1.37 | Groups(G) | 2/413 | 28.65 | .001 |
| 4-6 | 215 | 1.56 | 2.72 | 1.16 | Tests (T) | 1/413 | 482.55 | .001 |
| 7-9 | 69 | 2.52 | 2.77 | .25 | GxT | 2/413 | 30.31 | .001 |
| **Pronunciation** | | | | | | | | |
| K-3 | 132 | 1.21 | 2.38 | 1.17 | Groups(G) | 2/413 | 37.97 | .001 |
| 4-6 | 215 | 1.53 | 2.40 | .87 | Tests (T) | 1/413 | 347.93 | .001 |
| 7-9 | 69 | 2.61 | 2.70 | .09 | GxT | 2/413 | 32.38 | .001 |
| **Situation Interpretation** | | | | | | | | |
| K-3 | 132 | .84 | 2.14 | 1.30 | Groups(G) | 2/413 | 12.26 | .001 |
| 4-6 | 215 | 1.11 | 2.44 | 1.33 | Tests (T) | 1/413 | 681.34 | .001 |
| 7-9 | 69 | 1.59 | 2.49 | .90 | GxT | 2/413 | 5.29 | .005 |
| **Intonation** | | | | | | | | |
| K-3 | 132 | .89 | 2.17 | 1.28 | Groups(G) | 2/413 | .40 | NS |
| 4-6 | 215 | 1.11 | 1.98 | .87 | Tests (T) | 1/413 | 631.66 | .001 |
| 7-9 | 69 | 1.04 | 1.87 | .83 | GxT | 2/413 | 13.29 | .001 |
| **Total Score (Oral Fluency)** | | | | | | | | |
| K-3 | 132 | .99 | 2.29 | 1.30 | Groups(G) | 2/413 | 14.62 | .001 |
| 4-6 | 215 | 1.31 | 2.39 | 1.08 | Tests (T) | 1/413 | 805.42 | .001 |
| 7-9 | 69 | 1.90 | 2.46 | .56 | GxT | 2/413 | 21.39 | .001 |

As Table 5 shows all F-ratios for Tests (T) are highly significant ($p < .001$) indicating that for the total ESL sample, regardless of grade level, children in the program made significant pre- to post-test gains in each language skill area. However, as the interaction (GxT) F-ratios also show, the differences among the three grade groups were highly significant ($p < .001$). These findings support the conclusion that, based on teachers' ratings of children's English language skills, the ESL Program was the most successful with children in the lowest grades (K-3) and the least successful with children in the highest grades (7-9).

The results in District 24 are not inconsistent with general knowledge in the field of language learning. Language gains are generally greater among younger children.

The total scores on the OLAS were used in another analysis which compares the number of pupils at each general oral fluency level at the beginning of the program with the number at each level at the end of the program. The findings are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE AT EACH ORAL LANGUAGE FLUENCY LEVEL AT THE BEGINNING AND END OF THE PROGRAM

| Pre-test Oral Fluency Level | | | Post-test Oral Fluency Level | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | F | | E | | D | | C | |
| Rating | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) |
| F | 157 | (38) | 7 | (4) | 52 | (33) | 93 | (59) | 5 | ( 3) |
| E | 111 | (27) | 0 | (0) | 10 | ( 9) | 93 | (84) | 8 | ( 7) |
| D | 121 | (29) | 0 | (0) | 2 | ( 2) | 79 | (65) | 40 | (33) |
| C | 27 | ( 6) | 0 | (0) | 0 | ( 0) | 8 | (30) | 19 | (70) |
| Total | 416 | (100) | 7 | (2) | 64 | (15) | 273 | (66) | 72 | (17) |

As Table 6 shows, 38 percent of the evaluation sample were rated "F" in oral fluency at the beginning of the program, while 27 percent, 29 percent and 6 percent were rated "E," "D," and "C," respectively, by their ESL teachers. By the end of the program only two percent were rated "F," 15 percent were rated "E," 66 percent were rated "D" and 17 percent were rated "C."

The data do show, however, a definite trend in favor of those children rated lowest in English at the beginning of the program. The pattern that evolves is one in which teachers tend to rate more of the children rated "F" as having moved up more levels in English proficiency than children in any of the other oral fluency levels. As Table 6 indicates, based on teachers' ratings, 33 percent of the children rated lowest (F)

initially moved one level to "E," 59 percent of this group moved two levels to "D," and three percent moved three levels to a "C" rating. However, those children with the most facility in English at the beginning of the program (C level), according to their own teachers' assessment, made no gain in their basic oral fluency level. In fact, 30 percent of the children rated "C" at the beginning of the program were rated one level lower at the end of the program and the remaining 70 percent were rated at the same "C" level.

These findings indicate that teachers' subjective ratings on language measures, such as the OLAS, are inadequate measures for discriminating among finer levels of pupil growth in English as a second language. It is possible that the children in the program who initially had the least proficiency in English were actually the ones who made the greatest gains, especially since these children generally received the most instruction. It is possible, however, that teachers' post-program ratings were somewhat inflated since children who speak no English at all at the beginning of the program will likely appear to have made extensive gain if they speak any English at all at the end of the program. Consider, too, that it is unlikely that all of the children rated at the highest level of proficiency (C) made no gains in basic oral fluency in English by the end of the program. These children received not only special instruction in English

as a second language, but regular classroom instruction also. The more reasonable explanation relates to the basic inadequacy of the oral fluency scale in discriminating language growth among children with some reasonable facility in English. As indicated in last year's report, measures like the "A to F" scale "can clearly be used to identify F-rated children, those who are unable to respond satisfactorily. It is less appropriate for discriminating among E, D or C level children."

Receptive English Language Proficiency. In order to obtain a more objective measure of pupil growth in English as a second language, arrangements were made to administer the Linguistic Capacity Index (LCI) on a pre- and post-program basis. This test was developed as a measure of English language readiness and has been used to assess pupil achievement in learning English as a foreign language.

The LCI is a receptive language measure consisting of three sections: vocabulary recognition, contrastive phonology, and contrastive grammar. A total score is derived from the sum of the three subsection scores. Table 7 presents the sample sizes, pre-and post-program means, the mean gain and the results of the groups by test analyses of variance for each subtest and the total score on the Linguistic Capacity Index.

TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF GAINS ON THE
LINGUISTIC CAPACITY INDEX (LCI)

| Grade Level | N | Pre-Mean | Post-Mean | Gain | Analysis of Variance Results: Source | df | F-Ratio | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Vocabulary Recognition** | | | | | | | | |
| K-3 | 132 | 11.34 | 15.55 | 4.21 | Groups(G) | 2/413 | 32.18 | .001 |
| 4-6 | 215 | 14.01 | 17.48 | 3.47 | Tests (T) | 1/413 | 300.08 | .001 |
| 7-9 | 69 | 17.00 | 17.84 | .84 | GxT | 2/413 | 17.95 | .001 |
| **Contrastive Phonology** | | | | | | | | |
| K-3 | 132 | 9.31 | 12.17 | 2.86 | Groups(G) | 2/413 | 13.54 | .001 |
| 4-6 | 215 | 10.94 | 13.76 | 2.82 | Tests (T) | 1/413 | 297.712 | .001 |
| 7-9 | 69 | 11.29 | 14.43 | 3.14 | GxT | 2/413 | .214 | NS |
| **Contrastive Grammar** | | | | | | | | |
| K-3 | 132 | 10.74 | 14.14 | 3.40 | Groups(G) | 2/413 | 24.07 | .001 |
| 4-6 | 215 | 13.12 | 15.86 | 2.74 | Tests (T) | 1/413 | 227.67 | .001 |
| 7-9 | 69 | 15.52 | 17.16 | 1.64 | GxT | 2/413 | 5.02 | .005 |
| **Total Score** | | | | | | | | |
| K-3 | 132 | 31.36 | 41.86 | 10.50 | Groups(G) | 2/413 | 15.05 | .001 |
| 4-6 | 215 | 37.93 | 47.02 | 9.09 | Tests (T) | 1/413 | 381.18 | .001 |
| 7-9 | 69 | 43.88 | 49.28 | 5.40 | GxT | 2/413 | 6.86 | .001 |

The pre-test means shown in Table 7 reveal a consistent pattern among the groups of students in grades kindergarten through the third grade, fourth through sixth, and seventh through ninth. For vocabulary recognition, contrastive phonology, contrastive grammar and the total score, as measured by the LCI, the mean scores gradually increased on the pre-test as the groups increased in grade level. The post-test means follow a similar pattern across grade levels, however, the gain scores reveal a pattern which is nearly reversed. The gain scores in Table 7 show that the K-3 group gained more than the 4-6 group in all three subsections and the total score of the LCI, and that the 4-6 group gained more than the 7-9 group on two of the subsections and the total score of the LCI. The exception to the pattern evident in the gain scores occurs in the contrastive phonology subtest. In this instance, the 7-9 group gained more than either the K-3 group or the 4-6 group.

The analysis of variance results in Table 7 show that all F-ratios for Tests (T) are highly significant ($p < .001$) indicating that on the LCI measure, also, program participants as a whole made significant pre- to post-program gains in each language skill area. The analysis of variance results further indicate that the age related pattern of the gains (younger groups gained more) were significant. The one exception to this pattern is shown in the contrastive phonology subtest of the LCI. The interaction (GxT)

F-ratio for this subtest was not significant indicating that although the oldest students made greater gains than the other two groups, the differences among the group gains were not significantly different. The interaction (Gx') F-ratios for vocabulary recognition, contrastive grammar and total score on the LCI were significant. These data support the findings discussed from the OLAS teacher ratings. The ESL program was more effective at the lower grade levels than it was at the upper grade levels.

While the age related nature of language learning facility may be the major factor to account for these results, additional factors should be considered. The additional factors may include variation in instructional approaches and teacher effectiveness at the elementary and junior high schools. Observations of the classroom program indicated a general trend that showed instruction to be more appropriate for children at the elementary level than it was at the junior high school. Further examination of ways to improve ESL teaching effectiveness, particularly at the upper grade levels, is clearly warranted.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Examination of program records, classroom observations and interviews with the ESL staff revealed the following.

1. Major changes in the planned program design were made at each school. These changes did result in more students

being serviced by the program than originally planned, but the changes also resulted in a concomitant reduction in the average amount of instruction in English received by students in the program.

2. The high mobility of the non-English speaking student population brought some instability to the instructional program and further reduced the amount of instruction students received. A number of students were transferred to the mainstream program before their language facility was adequate for academic success in a regular classroom program.

3. A wide range of ESL teacher competence was observed. In general, ESL teachers were skilled in a narrow range of teaching behaviors related to second language learning.

Analysis of pupil performance on the Oral Language Ability Scale and the Linguistic Capacity Index resulted in the following findings.

1. For the total ESL sample, regardless of grade level, students in the program showed significant pre-to post-test gains in all receptive and productive English language skill areas.

2. A consistent age related pattern of language learning emerged from the data. Children in grades kindergarten through grade 3 showed the greatest growth in English proficiency, students in grades 4 through 6 demonstrated somewhat less growth,

while students in grades 7 to 9 demonstrated the least amount of growth in English proficiency.

While the data did show that students in the ESL program made significant gains in their ability to understand and speak English, no conclusive statement can be made about the program's effectiveness since no comparison group was available. It is difficult to conclude, therefore, that the gains made by the students in the ESL program were greater than those that might have been expected from students in a regular program with no specialized instruction in English.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this evaluation of the ESL program, the following recommendations are made.

1. An effort must be made to structure the ESL program so that students will receive consistent and adequate amounts of instruction in the use of English commensurate with their level of language proficiency.

2. A study should be made of the extent and nature of the population mobility in each school in order to design a program that would provide stable instruction for larger numbers of students. Provisions must be made to offer new arrivals needed instruction in English without transferring students to the mainstream before they are proficient enough in English to succeed academically.

3. There is a need to recruit teachers for the program who have been adequately trained in ESL techniques or to expand the inservice training in order to improve the present ESL teachers' effectiveness.

4. While oral fluency in English is essential as a valid objective, the ESL program should be expanded to include the tool subjects of reading and writing in English if students are to successfully achieve in the regular school curriculum.

5. Because of the subjective nature of teacher ratings, it is suggested that whenever possible more objective measures, such as the Linguistic Capacity Index, also be used. Multiple measures provide more accurate information for pupil selection, for diagnosis of children's language strengths and weaknesses, and for assessment of pupil achievement in learning English as a second language.

6. Analysis of pre- and post-program scores showed that the youngest children in the program (grades kindergarten to 3) made the greatest gains. Although the greater language learning facility generally found among younger children may account for this finding, other factors such as differences in instructional approach, program structure and teacher effectiveness may have been operating. These and other factors should be examined in order to determine how the effectiveness of the program might be increased in the upper grades.

APPENDIX A through E

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

APPENDIX A

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM - DISTRICT 24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

READING TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

School _____ Date _____

Reading Teacher's Name _____ Code (leave blank)_____

Funding: 1. Title I ___ 2. Optional Assign. __ 3. State Urban___

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or the Board of Education will have access to these data.

SECTION A - EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TRAINING

The following questions are aimed at an assessment of the inservice training provided for Corrective Reading Teachers as part of this year's program. We ask for your honest appraisal of this aspect of the program.

1. Instructions. Listed below are topics which may have been covered during the afternoon staff meetings. Use the rating scale below to evaluate the adequacy with which each was covered during training sessions. Put your rating in the space provided before the topic. For any item that was not covered, write NC.

   Scale: 5=Very Satisfactory, 4=Above Average, 3=Average, 2=Barely Satisfactory, 1=Unsatisfactory, NC=Not Covered

| Rating | | Topic |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Organization, administration and supervision of the program |
| _____ | (b) | Objectives and rationale for the program |

| Rating | | Topic |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (c) | Criteria for selection of program participants |
| _____ | (d) | Procedures for selection of student participants |
| _____ | (e) | Specific procedures for diagnosis |
| _____ | (f) | Knowledge of reading skills |
| _____ | (g) | Methods of corrective instruction |
| _____ | (h) | Use of instructional materials |
| _____ | (i) | Teacher selection and evaluation of program material |
| _____ | (j) | Organizing the class for instruction |
| _____ | (k) | Techniques for evaluating pupil progress |
| _____ | (l) | Record-keeping policies and procedures |
| _____ | (m) | Techniques for using paraprofessionals in the program |
| _____ | (n) | Techniques for parent involvement |
| _____ | (o) | Other (Please specify) _____ |
| | | _____ |

2. In your opinion, was the amount of inservice training sufficient?

1. No ___ 2. Yes ___

3. Please give your overall rating of the inservice training provided for Corrective Reading Teachers this year.

1. Unsatisfactory____ 2. Barely Satisfactory____

3. Average____ 4. Above Average____ 5. Very Satisfactory____

4. Did you participate in the Corrective Reading Program last year (1971-72)?

1. No ___ 2. Yes ___

5. If your answer to question 4 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's training program in comparison to last year's sessions? On the whole, this year's training was:

1._____ Inferior  2._____ About the same  3._____ Superior

Please feel free to write additional comments about the inservice training provided by the program and your suggestions for improvement.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

SECTION B - READING TEACHER EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. Listed below are items related to different aspects of the Corrective Reading Program. Use the following rating system to evaluate the quality and/or effectiveness of each aspect of the program.

   1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Barely Satisfactory, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, 5=Very satisfactory, NA=Not Appropriate

Program Organization

| Rating | | Item |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Organization of the program (number of classes, scheduling, etc.) |
| _____ | (b) | Amount of time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction |
| _____ | (c) | Number of pupils in each group |
| _____ | (d) | Overall Rating for Program Organization |

Pupil Selection

| Rating | | Item |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Criteria used to select pupils for the Corrective Reading Program |
| _____ | (b) | Procedures used to select pupil participants |
| _____ | (c) | Assignment of pupils to instructional groups on basis of severity of reading retardation |
| _____ | (d) | Overall Rating for Pupil Selection |

Need

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Number of students serviced by the program compared to number who need corrective reading instruction |

Physical Facilities and Materials

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Size of the room provided by the school |
| _____ | (b) | Physical facilities in the room |
| _____ | (c) | Adequacy of the types of instructional (workbooks, literature, audio visual aids, etc.) materials in the program |
| _____ | (d) | Quantity of materials provided for the number of children serviced |
| _____ | (e) | Availability of materials at the start of the program |
| _____ | (f) | Overall Rating for Facilities and Materials |

Procedures for Diagnosis and Evaluation

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Use of the Informal Reading Inventory to establish reading levels and to evaluate growth in reading |
| _____ | (b) | Use of the Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading |
| _____ | (c) | Use of the Stanford Diagnostic Test to assess individual weaknesses and strengths in reading |

| Rating | | Item |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (d) | Adequacy of materials and instruments supplied for diagnosis and evaluation |
| _____ | (e) | Appropriateness of the record keeping system established for the program |
| _____ | (f) | Overall rating for Diagnostic and Evaluative Procedures and materials used in the program |

Students

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Pupils' attitude toward the corrective reading classes |
| _____ | (b) | Observable improvement in pupil performance |

Parental Involvement and Attitude

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Extent of parent involvement in the Corrective Reading Program |
| _____ | (b) | Parent's attitude toward the program |
| _____ | (c) | Time to confer with parents through individual and/or group conferences |

Personnel Support

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Cooperation of school personnel generally |
| _____ | (b) | Communication between classroom teachers and yourself about pupil progress |
| _____ | (c) | Extent to which reading materials, procedures, and techniques used in the Corrective Reading Program have been adapted by classroom teachers |
| _____ | (d) | Amount of time provided to confer with classroom teachers |
| _____ | (e) | Classroom teachers' attitudes toward Corrective Reading Program |
| _____ | (f) | Supervision and assistance provided by the reading coordinator |

2. Did you participate in the Corrective Reading Program last year?

1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

3. If your answer to question 2 is yes, what is your overall impression when you compare this year's program to last year's program? This year's Corrective Reading Program is:

1. _____ Inferior 2. _____ About the same 3. _____ Superior

4. Would you be interested in participating in a similar program next year?

1. Yes _____ 2. No _____ 3. Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement. (We would be interested especially in your comments about those aspects of the program you rated low in item 1 above.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

SECTION C - READING TEACHER EVALUATION OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

1. Paraprofessionals

(a) How many paraprofessionals were assigned to your reading program? _____

(b) Could you have used additional paraprofessionals?

Yes _____ No _____

(c) When did they begin working? _____

(d) Did the paraprofessionals receive any special training for the program?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, who provided the training? _____

_____

(e) Briefly describe responsibilities assumed by the paraprofessional(s) in your program.

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

(f) Please rate the adequacy of the paraprofessionals preparation and skills for the program

1 Inadequate | 2 Barely Satisfactory | 3 Satisfactory | 4 Above Average

5 Very Satisfactory

(g) What is your overall rating of the services provided by the paraprofessionals?

1 Unsatisfactory | 2 Barely Satisfactory | 3 Average | 4 Above Average

5 Very Satisfactory

(h) Indicate your suggestions for improving the contributions that can be made by paraprofessionals in this Corrective Reading Program.

_____

_____

_____

2. Guidance Services (Optional Assignment Program)

(a) Approximately how many of your corrective reading students received the services of the guidance counselor?

_____

(b) How would you rate the frequency of your contacts with the guidance counselor regarding your students?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| None | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Very Often |

(c) How would you rate the quality of your contacts with the guidance counselor? That is, to what degree did his/her services help in leading to the resolution of students' problems?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Not helpful | | Helpful | | Very Helpful |

(d) What suggestions do you have for improving the guidance services provided for optional assignment students in the reading program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

SECTION D - READING TEACHER BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

| Degree | Year | Institution | Major Field |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

2. COURSE WORK RELEVANT TO TEACHING CORRECTIVE READING

Check those courses which you have taken and indicate the institution and year. (Do not include inservice courses here.)

| Content of Course | Institution | Year |
|---|---|---|
| ___Foundations of Reading Instruction | _____ | _____ |
| ___Diagnostic Techniques - Reading | _____ | _____ |
| ___Corrective Reading Instruction | _____ | _____ |
| ___Reading in the Content Areas | _____ | _____ |
| ___Teaching Individualized Reading | _____ | _____ |
| Other | | |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |

3. TEACHING EXPERIENCE

| School | Grades | No. of Years | Regular or Substitute |
|---|---|---|---|
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

4. EXPERIENCES SPECIFIC TO TEACHING CORRECTIVE READING

Check those experiences which you have had nd the number of years

| Experience | No. of Years |
|---|---|
| ___Corrective Reading - Public Schools | _____ |
| ___After-school Tutorial Reading Program | _____ |
| ___Parent-volunteer Reading Tutor | _____ |
| ___Private tutorial work in Reading | _____ |
| Other | |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |

5. INSERVICE COURSES IN CORRECTIVE READING

List the inservice courses relevant to Corrective Reading which you took before this academic year.

| Course | Year |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

6. PRESENT INSERVICE COURSES

List any inservice courses related to Corrective Reading which you have taken this year,

| Course | Instructor |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

APPENDIX B

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM - DISTRICT 24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME_____ DATE _____

SCHOOL_____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluating the program and for making recommendations for improvement. No person connected with the school or the Board of Education will have access to these data.

SECTION A - EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TRAINING

The following questions are aimed at an assessment of the inservice training provided for Corrective Reading Teachers as part of this year's program. Please answer to the best of your knowledge.

1. In your opinion, was the amount of inservice training sufficient?

   1. No _____ 2. Yes _____ 3. Don't know _____

2. Give your overall rating of the adequacy of the inservice training that was provided for Corrective Reading Teachers.

   1. Unsatisfactory ___ 2. Barely satisfactory ___
   3. Average ___ 4. Above Average ___ 5. Very satisfactory ___
   (DK) Don't Know ___

3. Did any of your teachers participate in the Reimbursable Corrective Reading Program last year (1971-72)?

   1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

4. If your answer to question 3 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's inservice training program in comparison to last year's. On the whole, this year's training was:

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|
| Inferior | About the same | Superior |

Please feel free to write additional comments about the inservice training provided for teachers in the Corrective Reading Program.

_____

_____

_____

_____

SECTION B - PRINCIPALS' EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. Instructions: Listed below are items about aspects of the Corrective Reading Program in District 24. Use the following scale to evaluate the quality and/or the effectiveness of the reading program.

   Scale: 1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Barely Satisfactory, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, 5=Very Satisfactory

Program Organization

| Rating | | Item |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Organization of the program (including number of classes, scheduling of classes, etc.) |
| _____ | (b) | Amount of time allocated to corrective reading instruction |
| _____ | (c) | Number of pupils in each reading group |
| _____ | (d) | Overall Rating for Program Organization |

Pupil Selection

| Rating | | Item |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Criteria used to select pupils for the Corrective Reading Program |
| _____ | (b) | Procedures used to select pupil participants |
| _____ | (c) | Assignment of pupils to instructional groups on the basis of severity of reading retardation |
| _____ | (d) | Overall Rating for this area |

Need

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Number of students serviced by the program compared to the number who need corrective reading instruction |

Physical Facilities and Materials

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Size of the room(s) provided for the program |
| _____ | (b) | Physical facilities in the room(s) |
| _____ | (c) | Adequacy of the types of instructional materials (texts, workbooks, literature, audio visual, etc.) used in the program |
| _____ | (d) | Quantity of materials provided for the number of children serviced |
| _____ | (e) | Availability of materials at the start of the program |
| _____ | (f) | Overall Rating for this area |

Procedures for Diagnosis and Evaluation

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Use of the Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading |
| _____ | (b) | Use of the Stanford Diagnostic Test to assess individual strengths and weaknesses in reading |

| Rating | | Item |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (c) | Appropriateness of the materials and instruments used for diagnosis and evaluation |
| _____ | (d) | Appropriateness of the record keeping system established for the program |
| _____ | (e) | Overall Rating for this area |

Students

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Students' attitude toward corrective reading classes |
| _____ | (b) | Observable improvement in pupil performance |

Parental Involvement and Attitude

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Extent of parent involvement in the Corrective Reading Program |
| _____ | (b) | Parents' attitude toward the program |
| _____ | (c) | Time for teachers to confer with parents through individual and/or group conferences |

Personnel Support

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Cooperation of school personnel generally |
| _____ | (b) | Communication between corrective reading teacher(s) and classroom teachers about pupil progress |
| _____ | (c) | Extent to which reading materials, procedures, and techniques used in the Corrective Reading Program have been adapted by classroom teachers |
| _____ | (d) | Amount of time available for corrective reading teachers to confer with classroom teachers |

| Rating | | Item |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (e) | Classroom teachers' attitude toward the program |
| _____ | (f) | Quality of the services provided by the paraprofessionals |
| _____ | (g) | Teachers' ability to use paraprofessionals effectively in the program |
| _____ | (h) | Adequacy of the corrective reading teachers' preparation and skills required for the program |
| _____ | (i) | Quality of the instruction generally provided by the corrective reading teachers |
| _____ | (j) | Ongoing supervision and guidance provided by the reading coordinator |

2. Did your school participate in the Corrective Reading Program last year (1971-72)?

   1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

3. If your answer to question 2 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's program in comparison to last year's?

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|
| Inferior | About the same | Superior |

4. Would you be interested in your school participating in a similar program next year?

   1. No _____ 2. Yes _____ 3. Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement. We would be especially interested in your comments about those aspects of the program you rated low in item 1 above.

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM - DISTRICT 24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

READING COORDINATOR'S EVALUATION
OF CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

Name _____ Date _____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program.

SECTION A - EVALUATION OF INSERVICE TRAINING

1. Instructions: Listed below are topics which may have been covered during the afternoon staff meetings. Using the scale below, indicate the extent to which each topic was adequately covered during these sessions.

   Scale: 5=Very staisfactory, 4=Above average, 3=Average, 2=Barely satisfactory, 1=Unsatisfactory, NC=Not covered

| Rating | | Topic |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Organization, administration and supervision of the program |
| _____ | (b) | Objectives and rationale for the program |
| _____ | (c) | Criteria for selection of program participants |
| _____ | (d) | Procedures for selection of student participants |
| _____ | (e) | Specific procedures for diagnosis |
| _____ | (f) | Knowledge of reading skills |
| _____ | (g) | Methods of corrective instruction |
| _____ | (h) | Use of instructional materials |
| _____ | (i) | Teacher selection and evaluation of program materials |

| Rating | | Topic |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (j) | Organizing the class for instruction |
| _____ | (k) | Techniques for evaluating pupil progress |
| _____ | (l) | Record keeping policies and procedures |
| _____ | (m) | Techniques for using paraprofessionals in the program |
| _____ | (n) | Techniques for parent involvement |
| _____ | (o) | Other (Please specify) _____ |
| | | _____ |

2. In your opinion, was the amount of inservice training sufficient?

   1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

3. Please give your overall rating of the inservice training provided for Corrective Reading Teachers this year.

   1. Unsatisfactory ___ 2. Barely satisfactory ___
   3. Average ___ 4. Above average ___ 5. Very satisfactory ___

4. How would you evaluate this year's training program in comparison to last year's sessions? On the whole, this year's training was:

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|
| Inferior | About the same | Superior |

Please feel free to write additional comments about the <u>inservice training</u> provided by the program this year and your suggestions for improvement.

_____

_____

_____

_____

SECTION B - COORDINATOR'S EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. Listed below are items related to aspects of the Corrective Reading Program. Use the following rating system to evaluate the quality and/or effectiveness of each aspect of the program.

   Scale: 1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Barely satisfactory, 3=Average, 4=Above average, 5=Very satisfactory, NA=Not appropriate

Program Organization

| Rating | | Item |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Organization of the program (number of classes, scheduling, etc.) |
| _____ | (b) | Amount of time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction |
| _____ | (c) | Number of pupils in each group |
| _____ | (d) | Overall Rating for Program Organization |

Pupil Selection

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Criteria used to select pupils for the Corrective Reading Program |
| _____ | (b) | Procedures used to select pupil participants |
| _____ | (c) | Assignment of pupils to instructional groups on the basis of severity of reading retardation |
| _____ | (d) | Overall Rating for Pupil Selection |

Need

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Number of students serviced by the program compared to the number who need corrective reading instruction |

Physical Facilities and Materials

| Rating | | Item |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Size of the room(s) provided for the program |
| _____ | (b) | Physical facilities in the room(s) |
| _____ | (c) | Adequacy of the types of instructional materials (texts, workbooks, literature, audio visual aids, etc.) used in the program |
| _____ | (d) | Quantity of materials provided for the number of children serviced |
| _____ | (e) | Availability of materials at the start of the program |
| _____ | (f) | Overall Rating for Facilities and Materials |

Procedures for Diagnosis and Evaluation

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Use of the Informal Inventory to establish reading levels and to evaluate growth in reading |
| _____ | (b) | Use of the Metropolitan Reading Test to evaluate growth in reading |
| _____ | (c) | Use of the Stanford Diagnostic Test to assess individual weaknesses and strengths in reading |
| _____ | (d) | Adequacy of materials and instruments used for diagnosis and evaluation |
| _____ | (e) | Appropriateness of the record keeping system established for the program |
| _____ | (f) | Overall Rating for diagnostic and evaluative procedures |

Students

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Students' attitude toward the program |
| _____ | (b) | Observable improvement in pupil performance |

Parental Involvement and Attitude

| Rating | | Item |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Extent of parental involvement in the Corrective Reading Program |
| _____ | (b) | Parents' attitude toward the program |
| _____ | (c) | Time for teachers to confer with parents through individual and/or group conferences |

Personnel Support

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Cooperation of school personnel generally |
| _____ | (b) | Communication between corrective reading teachers and classroom teachers about pupil progress |
| _____ | (c) | Extent to which ideas, reading materials, procedures, and techniques used in the Corrective Reading Program have been adapted by classroom teachers |
| _____ | (d) | Amount of time available for corrective reading teachers to confer with classroom teachers |
| _____ | (e) | Classroom teachers' attitude toward the program |
| _____ | (f) | Quality of the services provided by the paraprofessionals |
| _____ | (g) | Teachers' satisfaction with the services provided by the paraprofessionals |
| _____ | (h) | Teachers' ability to use paraprofessionals effectively in the program |
| _____ | (i) | Adequacy of the corrective reading teachers' preparation and skills required for the program |
| _____ | (j) | Quality of the instruction generally provided by the corrective reading teachers |

3. What is your overall impression when you compare this year's program to last year's? This year's Corrective Reading Program is:

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|
| Inferior | About the same | Superior |

Please give your general evaluation of the program, indicating specific strengths and weaknesses. Feel free to comment on or to give reasons for your ratings in 1 and 2 above.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX D

CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM - DISTRICT 24

New York University
The Center for Field Research and School Services

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS
WITH STUDENTS IN THE REIMBURSABLE CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

YOUR NAME _____ DATE _____

SCHOOL _____

PLEASE NOTE: All responses will be held in strict confidence and will be used only for evaluation of the program. No person connected with the school or the Board of Education will have access to these data.

1. How many children in your class(es) participate in the Title I, Optional Assignment or State Urban Corrective Reading Program this year? _____

2. Instructions: Listed below are items about aspects of the Corrective Reading Program. Use the following rating system to evaluate the effectiveness of the reading program:

   Scale: 1=Unsatisfactory, 2=Barely Satisfactory, 3=Satisfactory, 4=Above Average, 5=Very Satisfactory, NA=Not Appropriate

Program Organization

| Rating | | Item |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Organization and scheduling of corrective reading classes |
| _____ | (b) | Amount of time allocated for pupils receiving corrective reading instruction |
| _____ | (c) | Overall Rating for this area |

Need

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | (a) | Number of children serviced by the program compared to number who need corrective reading instruction |

Pupil Selection

Rating — Item

_____ (a) Criteria used to select pupils for the Corrective Reading Program

_____ (b) Procedures used to select pupils

_____ (c) Overall Rating for this area

Student and Parent Attitudes

_____ (a) Students' attitude toward corrective reading classes

_____ (b) Observable improvement in students' reading performance during regular class activities

_____ (c) Parents' attitude toward children's participation in the Corrective Reading Program

Support

_____ (a) Communication between corrective reading teacher(s) and yourself about pupil progress

_____ (b) Extent to which you have adapted ideas, materials, procedures and techniques used in the Corrective Reading Program

_____ (c) Amount of time available to confer with corrective reading teacher(s)

3. Did any children in your class last year participate in the Corrective Reading Program (1971-72)?

   1. No _____ 2. Yes _____

4. If your answer to 3 is yes, how would you evaluate this year's program in comparison to last year's? On the whole, this year's program is:

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|
| Inferior | About the same | Superior |

5. Would you be interested in your pupils participating in a similar program next year?

   1. No _____ 2. Yes _____ 3. Not sure _____

Please feel free to write additional comments about the program and suggestions for improvement.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

## APPENDIX E

## INDEX OF READING ATTITUDE

School _____ Name _____

Teacher _____ Grade _____ Date _____

Circle the number which most closely tells how you feel about each of the statements listed below.

1 - almost always
2 - often
3 - sometimes
4 - not often
5 - almost never

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Reading makes me feel good. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | I read the newspaper. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | I read before I go to bed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | Free reading time is the best part of school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | I like it when the teacher reads aloud. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. | I talk about books I have read. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | I am a good reader for my age. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | I get good grades on reading tests. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. | I read when I can do what I want to do. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | Reading is my favorite subject at school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. | I read magazines. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. | I read comic books. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. | I like to read paperbacks. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. | I like to talk about books I have read. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. | I like to read aloud. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

# APPENDIX A through E

## ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM

APPENDIX A

DISTRICT 24

ESL-SCALE FOR RATING ORAL LANGUAGE ABILITY OF PUPILS

Name _____ School _____ Grade _____ Date _____

ESL Teacher _____ Fluency Rating _____

| LEVEL | I. STRUCTURAL PATTERNS | II. VOCABULARY | III. PRONUNCIATION | IV. SITUATION INTERPRETATION | V. INTONATION |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| F (0) | Speaks no English | Speaks no English | Speaks no English | Speaks no English | Speaks no English |
| E (1) | a. Repeats Teacher's models.<br>b. Answers with single words.<br>c. Attempts to form simple patterns | Can identify 1 or 2 | Can reproduce 1-2 sounds | At least 1-2 responses | Speech has stress, pitch, & rhythm of native language |
| D (2) | a. Uses correct patterns for 3 or more<br>b. Agreement of grammatical elements. | Can identify 3 or 4 | Can reproduce 3-4 sounds | At least 3-4 responses | Has acquired some of the stress, pitch & rhythm of English |
| C (3) | Uses patterns automatically in all 5 | Can identify all 5 | Can reproduce all sounds | Able to answer all questions with a reasonable amount of detail | Uses stress, pitch & rhythm of English most of the time |

Directions:

1. Test to be given in this order:
   a. Pronunciation; b. Vocabulary;
   c. Structural Patterns; d. Situation Interpretation; e. Intonation (Teacher judgment)
2. Obtain Fluency Rating:
   a. Rate child in each column
   b. Sum the ratings
   c. Divide sum by 5 to obtain fluency rating

## APPENDIX B

### DISTRICT 24
### ESL OBSERVATION CHECKLIST

Scale: N/A=not applicable; 0=unacceptable' 1=barely acceptable; 2=acceptable; 3=good; 4=excellent

| Instructional Behaviors | N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Attitude/Manner | | | | | | |
| 2. Knowledge and Use of student names | | | | | | |
| 3. Ask question, then call on student | | | | | | |
| 4. Awareness of Student Needs | | | | | | |
| 5. Speech Pattern: colloquial; normal classroom speed | | | | | | |
| 6. How much did the teacher talk? Ratio of teacher/student talk? | | | | | | |
| 7. Was focus of lesson clear? | | | | | | |
| 8. How well was new material introduced? | | | | | | |
| 9. How well was material practiced after introduction? | | | | | | |
| 10. How much practice with new material? | | | | | | |
| 11. How well was drill extended into communication? | | | | | | |
| 12. Was the model appropriate for correct responses? | | | | | | |
| 13. Instructions and Cueing: Did students know what teacher expected? | | | | | | |
| 14. Variety of activities/change of pace | | | | | | |
| 15. Distribution of student participation among group. Are all students participating? | | | | | | |

| Instructional Behaviors | N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16. How well was "previously learned" material practiced, reviewed & reinforced? | | | | | | |
| 17. How well were corrections made? | | | | | | |
| 18. How well were students' questions answered by the teacher? | | | | | | |
| 19. How well were explanations made? | | | | | | |
| 20. How well was at-home follow-up accomplished? | | | | | | |
| 21. How well were audio visual aids employed? | | | | | | |
| 22. Did teacher recognize difference between teaching & testing? | | | | | | |
| 23. Did lesson have a beginning, a middle and an end? | | | | | | |
| 24. How well did teacher proceed from known to unknown? | | | | | | |
| 25. How well did teacher proceed from simple to complex? | | | | | | |
| 26. How well did teacher proceed from receptive to productive? | | | | | | |
| 27. How well did teacher proceed from concrete to abstract? | | | | | | |
| 28. How well did teacher proceed from manipulation to communication? | | | | | | |
| 29. How effective was practice in listening? | | | | | | |
| 30. How effective was practice in speaking? | | | | | | |
| 31. How effective was practice in reading? | | | | | | |
| 32. How effective was practice in writing? | | | | | | |
| 33. How effective was choral practice? | | | | | | |

| Instructional Behaviors | N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34. How effective was individual practice? | | | | | | |
| 35. If teacher used student's native language, how effectively was it done? | | | | | | |
| 36. Repetition after the teacher model? | | | | | | |
| 37. Response to language cues? | | | | | | |
| 38. Initiation of communication situations by students? | | | | | | |
| 39. How did teacher evaluate student comprehension & progress? | | | | | | |

| Student Behaviors | N/A | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. What was the classroom atmosphere & the rapport among students? | | | | | | |
| 2. What was level of student interest? | | | | | | |
| 3. What was student attitude toward materials? | | | | | | |
| How effective was individual student participation in: | | | | | | |
| 4. repetition? | | | | | | |
| 5. response? | | | | | | |
| 6. initiation? | | | | | | |
| 7. Did students seem to understand the teacher? | | | | | | |
| 8. Did students seem to understand the material? | | | | | | |
| 9. Did students use English outside of lesson framework? | | | | | | |
| 10. Did students correct each other? | | | | | | |

## APPENDIX C

### DISTRICT 24
### ESL NEW ENTRANT INFORMATION FORM
### 1972-1973

Fill out this form for each new student who enters your program and send to the ESL Coordinator along with the child's Scale for Rating Oral Language Ability and his/her Linguistic Capacity Index Booklet.

---

Child's Name _____ _____
(First) (Last)

School _____ Grade _____ Native Language _____

ESL Teacher _____ Instructional Group # _____
Instruction Period(s):
Day _____ From _____ to ____
Day _____ From _____ to ____
Day _____ From _____ to ____
Day _____ From _____ to ____

Date Child Entered Program _____

Comments _____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX D

DISTRICT 24
ESL EXIT INFORMATION FORM

Please complete this form for each student who leaves your program before the end of the year. If the child has been in the program for at least one month, then submit the child's post test Scale for Rating Oral Language Ability and his/her post test Linguistic Capacity Index Booklet.

Child's Name _____ _____
(First) (Last)

School _____ Grade _____ ESL Teacher _____

Date Child Entered Program _____ _____ _____
Month Day Year

Date Child Left Program _____ _____ _____
Month Day Year

Reason for Exit _____

Send this form to the ESL Coordinator at the District Office. Include post test rating scale record form and Linguistic Capacity Index booklet if child was in the program for at least one month.

## APPENDIX E

DISTRICT 24
ESL TRANSFER INFORMATION FORM
1972-1973

Fill out this form for each student who is transferred to another ESL group or teacher and return to the ESL Coordinator.

---

Child's Name _____ _____
(First) (Last)

School _____ Grade _____ ESL Teacher _____

---

Student transferred to:

A. New group _____ Instructional Period(s):

Day_____ From_____ to_____
Day_____ From_____ to_____
Day_____ From_____ to_____
Day_____ From_____ to_____
Day_____ From_____ to_____

B. Another teacher _____

Reason for the transfer _____

_____

_____

_____